

Concordia Theological Monthly



J U N E

•

1 9 5 2



Concordia Theological Monthly

Published by The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CONCORDIA SEMINARY
ST. LOUIS, MO.

*Address all communications to the Editorial Committee in care of
the Managing Editor, F.E. Mayer, 801 De Mun Ave., St. Louis 5, Mo.*

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

VICTOR BARTLING, PAUL M. BRETSCHER,
RICHARD R. CAEMMERER, THEODORE HOYER,
FREDERICK E. MAYER, WALTER R. ROEHRS, LOUIS J. SIECK

CONTENTS

FOR JUNE 1952

	PAGE
THE RISE AND FALL OF THE SCHMALKALDIC LEAGUE: THE TREATY OF PASSAU, 1552. <i>Theo. Hoyer</i>	401
THE BASIS OF OUR FAITH. <i>W.F. Beck</i>	418
INSIDE MISSOURI SYNOD. <i>James R. Blackwood</i>	428
HOMILETICS	439
SOME ANTI-PELAGIAN ECHOES IN AUGUSTINE'S "CITY OF GOD" <i>J. J. Pelikan</i>	448
SWEDISH EPISCOPAL LETTER ON SEX PROBLEMS	452
THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER	459
BOOK REVIEW	478

Leavell, Roland Q.: Evangelism, Christ's Imperative Commission. — Twenty Confirmation Sermons by Pastors of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. — *Lang, Paul H. D.*: The Lutheran Order of Services. — *Newton, John*: Voice of the Heart (Cardiphonia). — *Howard, Philip E., Jr.*: Bible Light on Daily Life. — *Jenkins, Daniel*: Europe and America, Their Contributions to the World Church. — *Bales, James D.*: Atheism's Faith and Fruits.

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY is published monthly by Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo., to which all business correspondence is to be addressed.

\$3.00 per annum, anywhere in the world, payable in advance.

Entered at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., as second-class matter. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 5, 1918.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

ynod

re of
i, Mo.

IECK

PAGE

401

418

428

439

448

452

459

478

Con-
Paul
Heart
kins,
h. —

shing
lence

e for
917,
r. S. A.

Concordia Theological Monthly

VOL. XXIII

JUNE, 1952

No. 6

The Rise and Fall of the Schmalkaldic League: The Treaty of Passau, 1552

By THEO. HOYER

THERE are several reasons that suggest the truce of Passau as a subject for special consideration at the present time. One is, of course, the date. Since 1883 we have followed up the great outstanding events in Reformation history by church-wide celebrations, beginning with Luther's birth and ending, in 1946, with Luther's death. But several events following Luther's death were to be of immense importance to the Lutheran Church; one of them is the Schmalkaldic War, ending in the truce of Passau, 1552, and the Religious Peace of Augsburg, 1555. — Another reason: We have seen a veritable flood of books on Luther and the Reformation appearing on the market in late years. In most of them this last period of Reformation history is rapidly passed over. Some of them even stop with Worms, 1521. Is there something significant in this? Up to Worms Luther is every man's hero — then the defection begins; one faction after the other deserts him as it becomes evident what kind of a reformation he initiates. And the writer faces the obligation of taking a stand: for or against. Others pass over this section with gentle — or not so gentle — references to "old Luther," his illness, and other less friendly attempts to explain his late years. And yet this period brings the final and inevitable clash between the old and new and in 1552 leads to the first legal accreditation of the Lutheran Church in Germany. It also furnishes the chief reason why the militant phase of the Counter Reformation struck Germany so late.

Let it be said at once: This article offers nothing new on the subject — as there is little new information on the whole Reformation story in most of the late treatises; a different approach, a new emphasis, a new and striking presentation of the old story. But a review of the facts and the meaning of this section of the story may not be unwelcome.

The story of the Schmalkaldic League really goes back to the first Diet of Speier, 1526. Luther had been excommunicated by the Pope and outlawed by the Diet of Worms, 1521. But the Emperor, Charles V, had to leave Germany at once to meet Francis I of France, who had invaded imperial domain in North Italy. In the meantime the Diets of Nuernberg in 1522 and 1524 had not dared to enforce the Edict of Worms and to take action against the Evangelicals for fear of precipitating civil war in Germany. But others were not so ready to let matters rest there. The papal legate at Worms, Aleander, urged Charles to have Luther arrested and destroyed at once, but the Emperor refused. Then the papal legate at Nuernberg, 1524, Campeggio, instigated a union of Catholic princes in South Germany, the League of Regensburg, 1524, and a similar union in North Germany, the League of Dessau, 1525; both leagues in their constitution made it their object to enforce the Edict of Worms, to eradicate Lutheranism. That was the first threat of force, the beginning of the Church's disruption. Purely in defense against this threat the League of Torgau was formed in 1526. The Emperor had defeated France; he was coming to the Diet of Speier to "clean house" in Germany. The outlook was dark for Lutherans. — Luther was very dubious; he would not give his consent to the Torgau League; to him it smelled of revolution against the government.

This time the Pope came to the rescue! — The king of France, captured by Charles, had been released after he, in the Peace of Madrid, had taken an oath to keep the peace in future. But the Pope released him from this oath and in the League of Cognac promised him subsidies in money and men to renew the war against Charles — the Hapsburgs were growing too powerful! And the Emperor, instead of coming to Speier, again had to take the field; and he knew very well where the real troublemaker lived; he sacked Rome in 1527. — And in Speier the danger of attack evaporated;

the Diet adopted the principle, later so famous: "*Cuius regio, eius religio*" — until a council could convene, each estate should so act in the matter of the Edict of Worms that they could answer to God and the Emperor. In the absence of danger the League of Torgau became inactive.

During the three years between the two Diets of Speier (1526 to 1529) Lutheran ranks spread phenomenally. But again the Emperor was by that time victorious; the second Diet of Speier, under pressure of Catholic princes, rescinded the resolution of 1526 and resolved to enforce the Edict of Worms. The Protest of the Lutheran princes (hence Protestants) was thrown into the imperial wastebasket and the delegates who delivered it to the Emperor into prison. At the same time the situation in Switzerland had approached a climax: The Catholic cantons had united against Zwingli and had concluded an alliance with Austria; they were ready for war. The Colloquy of Marburg and the attempt, chiefly fostered by Philip of Hesse and Zwingli, to unite Protestantism against Catholic attack, had failed. The Diet of Augsburg, 1530, resolved to give Lutherans six months' grace, till April 15, 1531; if by that time they would not return to the old Church voluntarily, they were to be forced. Meanwhile they were to leave Catholics unmolested; they were to aid the Emperor in stamping out the Zwinglians and the Anabaptists. The *Reichskammergericht* (the imperial Court of Appeals for all disputed legal cases within the Empire) was restored; every case of transfer of property could be appealed to this court; and by the very nature of this court (its members were appointed by the Emperor) every such case would be decided against the dissenters (the whole Church of Saxony, e. g., was supported by income from old Church property). If the decisions of this court were disregarded, the Emperor could attack them as violaters of the constitution of the Empire (for the Schmalkaldic War the Emperor used just this excuse, among others).

This situation led to the organization of the Schmalkaldic League. The recess of the Diet of Augsburg was published November 19, 1530. Lutheran princes and delegates of cities met at the little upland town of Schmalkalden, December 22—31, 1530. The first matter to be discussed was: What was to be their attitude toward the resolution of the Diet and the probable action of the Emperor:

continue in their passive resistance or turn to active defense? The *right* of resistance was settled by the lawyers; the State of Germany was really a loose federation of almost independent principalities and cities; the Emperor was not an absolute ruler, but the Estates ruled with him, and he had only those rights and powers which the Estates had conferred on him. On legal and constitutional grounds they questioned the Emperor's right to impose his will on them in religious matters. Again: The Diet had really referred the matter to a council; the Emperor had promised to use his influence with the Pope to convene a council. Until that council had considered the religious differences and reached a decision, the Lutherans held, the Emperor had no right of execution. Luther, very reluctantly, gave his consent.

There has been (shall we say: naturally?) much criticism of Luther because of this change of opinion; it seemed expedient and useful to support the Schmalkaldic League, hence he buried his scruples and promptly changed his convictions! But isn't it rather an outstanding example to prove that, as uncompromising and stubborn as Luther could be when he was convinced he was right, he was ready to listen to argument and to change his opinion when it was brought home to him (as in this case) that he had been ill-informed. In his "Warning to His Dear Germans" (October, 1530) he still bases his opinion chiefly on religious grounds; the constitutional and legal justification of opposition to the Emperor he leaves to the doctors of law; but if Pope and the hierarchy, without any authority to do so, take the sword, let them not be surprised and cry "Rebellion" when they perish by the sword. He for his own person still prefers passive resistance; he will incite no one to resist; but let them not presume on this; he will not have those called murderers and bloodhounds who resist murderers and bloodhounds; such resistance is not rebellion; a man is justified in defending his life and property against a lawless aggressor. If they will have war, let them have it; but it is on their heads.

Since the doctors of law have established in what cases resistance to constituted authority is legally permissible, and this contingency has actually arisen; since, farther, we have always taught that the law should function and prevail, inasmuch as the Gospel does not militate against the secular law, we cannot invalidate from

Scripture the claim to adopt defensive measures even against the Emperor or anyone acting in his name. And seeing that the situation has now become so dangerous that events may daily render such measures immediately necessary, not only on legal grounds, but as a matter of duty and fidelity to conscience, it is fitting to arm and be prepared against the threatening resort to lawless force. For in hitherto teaching that it is not permissible to resist constituted authority, we were unaware that the law itself permits such resistance.¹

Mackinnon, who is by no means willing to go with Luther through thick and thin, here says:

His inflaming protest against the policy of seeking to decide this issue by brute force, in order to re-establish the old corrupt and oppressive system, was fitted to carry conviction over the length and breadth of the empire. It was one of those prophetic utterances which, as Randolph said of John Knox's sermons, was more potent to stir the minds of men than the blast of ten thousand trumpets. It ignores, indeed, the fact that the Emperor and the more enlightened section of the opposition were not, on principle, hostile to at least a practical reformation of the old papal and priestly system. But it certainly was a questionable preliminary to such a reformation to undo by force the reforming work of Luther, who could justifiably claim to have challenged and shattered the evil system which the merely practical reformers had in vain assailed for over a hundred years.²

A word should here be said for Charles V.

The restoration of the unity of the Church became a major concern of the Empire, never forgotten in the midst of others of greater immediate urgency. He was no obstinate bigot bent on crushing heresy by force. That was to be a last resort, from which he was long withheld by lack of means and by political expediency, but chiefly because he believed, and continued to believe in spite of repeated disappointments, that the gulf which threatened to widen might be bridged by discussion and maybe by compromise. . . . Not till 1543 did he make up his mind, after all other expedients had failed, to attempt to crush heresy by force.³

This is right, with the addition that, even in his desire to reunite the Church, Charles had a political object, truly medieval: a united Church to prop the tottering Empire. In God's hand that reluctance of Charles to use his imperial power, to follow the urgent advice

of Rome to quash the Lutheran movement by force, became one of the means of saving Lutheranism. By the time Charles was ready to use his "last resort," Lutheranism was too strong to be eradicated by force of arms. In 1531 the Emperor could probably have crushed the League. But existing conditions prevented it; the Turk was threatening Vienna, and Charles needed the help of the Evangelical princes.

After that preliminary meeting in December, 1530, and just before the time of grace granted them by the Augsburg Diet had elapsed, while Melancthon was putting the last touches to that trumpet blast of the Reformation, the Apology, a bond was drafted, very carefully worded; the Emperor's name was omitted; the causes for action were only vaguely alluded to. The signers promised to stand by one another in defense of their faith against the legal proceedings of the *Reichskammergericht* and to resist any attempt to use force against them. It was signed on March 29, 1531, by the Elector of Saxony, the Landgrave of Hesse, the Duke of Lueneburg, the Prince of Anhalt, the two Counts of Mansfeld, and the representatives of the cities Magdeburg and Bremen.

As a result the Emperor treated the Lutherans very courteously at the Diet of Nuernberg, 1532; the religious truce was prolonged indefinitely; all cases against Protestants in the *Reichskammergericht* were to be quashed and no proceeding for religious causes initiated against any State; and a council was promised within six months. — The Lutherans assisted the Emperor in the Turkish campaign, in fact, proved to be more patriotic than the Catholic princes. Luther declared roundly that the Turk must be met and driven back; that all Germans must assist the Emperor in this action. The Turkish invasion was repelled.

The Schmalkaldic League became a real power. In 1534, Philip of Hesse persuaded it to support the cause of the banished Duke Ulrich of Wuerttemberg, who had been dispossessed by the Emperor in 1519 and his land incorporated in the Hapsburg possessions. Philip easily defeated Ferdinand, the Emperor's brother and regent (Charles himself was kept busy during this time by pirates on the Mediterranean). Ulrich was restored, declared in favor of the Reformation, and Wuerttemberg became Lutheran and, in 1535, joined the Schmalkaldic League; also Pomerania, Anhalt; the cities of

Augsburg, Hamburg, Hannover, Kempen, and the South German cities (a union with the South German cities had been arrived at on the basis of the Wittenberg Concord), Goslar, Goettingen, and Rostock. In 1539 Duke George of Saxony (perhaps Luther's bitterest enemy, but also the most honest and disinterested of the Catholic princes), died; and his successor, his brother Henry, with the joyful consent of his subjects, turned the land Lutheran; and Luther preached in the great hall of the castle in Leipzig, where Eck had debated with him 20 years before and Duke George had called his teaching pestilential. The new Elector of Brandenburg, Joachim, joined the Schmalkaldic League.

The Schmalkaldic League became an international power. Denmark joined in 1537. France courted the Schmalkaldic League; Francis I asked Melancthon to come to France to organize a new Church. Henry VIII of England ousted the Pope and made himself head of the English Church; for an eventual war with Charles (because of Henry's divorce from Charles' aunt, Katharine of Aragon) he began to dicker with the Schmalkaldic League for an alliance. Bavaria, though rapidly proceeding to the leadership among Catholic States, offered to support the Schmalkaldic League — not because they loved Luther, but because they hated the Hapsburgs. Cleve joined the Schmalkaldic League — and Anne of Cleve married Henry VIII of England! The three ecclesiastical electors, the Archbishops of Mainz, Koeln, and Trier, were contemplating the secularizing of their domains and becoming Protestants; that alarmed Charles because that threatened a large Protestant majority in the Electoral College and hence a Protestant emperor.

In the meantime the conduct of the Papacy had been disgusting, evidently subordinating the welfare of the Church to their anti-Hapsburg schemes; Pope Paul III, allied with Francis, who again was seeking alliance with the Turk. Charles invaded France and was defeated. Breslau was fanatically Lutheran. In Vienna, Bishop Faber said "the population was entirely Lutheran save himself and the Archduke." Romanist universities were almost without students. It was said that in Bavaria there were more monasteries than monks. Peter Paul Vergerius reported: There were no candidates for the priesthood, except a few paupers in Bohemia who could not even pay their ordination fees. The Roman Church seemed to lie in

the throes of dissolution, even where it had been strongest, and the Catholic princes were losing their power. The Emperor and his brother Ferdinand were considering whether a National German Church, to be organized by a German National Council (after the pattern of England), would not be the best solution.

To sidestep this danger, the Pope finally yielded to the pressure of the Emperor, the Diets, and the Lutherans and called a council, but it was merely for show, to forestall possible action of the Emperor. He sent delegates to the powers to ask where they wanted the council to assemble. The almost universal answer was: Not in Italy. So he called it to Italy! To Mantua. (Cp. the Historical Introduction to the Smalcald Articles, the visit of Legate Vergerius in Wittenberg, *Triglotta*, p. 47.) The council never met; only a few bishops came.

The threat of the general situation, and prominently the influence of the man who up to this time dominated the policy of the papal Curia, Cardinal Contarini, a policy of conciliation, led to the union conferences at Hagenau (June, 1540), Worms (November, 1540), and Regensburg (April, 1541), the last attempt at a compromise. The outcome only proved that while union formulas could be constructed, there was a great gulf between the two parties which Protestants would not cross; and the Catholics balked at articles on transubstantiation and the Mass, the divine primacy of the Pope, the universal priesthood of believers, the infallibility of councils. And Charles finally saw that Lutherans would not return unless compelled by force. — The final impulse toward this method of settling the controversies was perhaps given by the results of the Emperor's efforts (since 1521) to persuade (or force) the Pope to call a council where the two parties could be brought together for the purpose of discussing the differences. By 1542 he and the Pope had settled the place; the Pope had insisted on a city in Italy; the German estates demanded a council in Germany. As a compromise, Trent was picked, a city on the border of Italy and Austria (though a totally Italian city). A campaign against France intervened; but after the Peace of Crespy, November 19, 1544, the Pope issued a call for the Council of Trent to convene in March, 1545. But at the same time the Pope (against the definitely expressed will of the Emperor) issued secretly a program for the council which made

it impossible for Protestants to attend: Only Catholic bishops in good standing could vote (a first stipulation denied Protestants even the right to speak; but later this was changed); nothing settled in the Catholic Confutation of Augsburg (i.e., everything contained in the Augsburg Confession) should be discussed; Protestants should promise in advance to submit to the resolutions of the council without question. — The Emperor saw no possibility of reconciliation by means of the council; unity could be restored only by force. His correspondence with his sister Mary and his brother Ferdinand shows that by the middle of 1545 he had reached that decision.

But force he could not use unless the Schmalkaldic League was broken up. For this purpose the Emperor used that most unfortunate act, the bigamy of Philip of Hesse, and the jealousy and ambition of Maurice of Saxony.

Since 1526 Philip had urged Luther to grant his consent to a second marriage; it was denied. But finally, December 10, 1539, after Bucer had brought Luther a secret confession of Philip, he together with the faculty of Wittenberg gave their consent to a secret second marriage of Philip. — Jacobs⁴ calls this "the greatest blunder in Luther's career." It is difficult not to agree with him. Despite the never revealed secrets of Philip's confession there seems to be no excuse for this; explanation, yes, but no justification. But that is a different chapter.⁵ Here this must suffice: Since 1532 imperial law declared bigamy the same as adultery, a capital crime; and Philip himself had published the law in Hesse and subscribed to it. Of course, Philip's second marriage could not be kept secret; his second mother-in-law saw to that. And Charles jumped at the opportunity. A trial case offered. Charles claimed that a treaty had conferred the rule of Gelderland on him after the death of the present sovereign, the Duke of Cleve. But when the old Duke died, his son William (who was the brother-in-law of the Elector of Saxony) succeeded him. Here was a powerful anti-Hapsburg State, backed by the Schmalkaldic League, next to Hapsburg Netherlands. The Emperor offered Philip immunity for past crimes and advancement in the Emperor's service if he would see to it that the Duke of Cleve was not supported by the Schmalkaldic League against the Emperor; and Philip, humiliated by the criticism of his friends, isolated, shunned by them, was a ready tool for the Emperor's hands

to weaken the Schmalkaldic League. Duke Maurice of Saxony (son and successor of Henry, who had died in 1541) was the son-in-law of Philip and joined him. But the Elector of Saxony would not desert his brother-in-law. So the Schmalkaldic League was split. In 1543 the Emperor totally defeated Cleve and took the land; and the Protestants, hindered by Philip, had to see a powerful ally overthrown. Mutual recriminations grew; and when the Emperor was ready to attack the Schmalkaldic League, it was not difficult to persuade the Elector of Brandenburg and others to keep out of the mess.

Meanwhile the Emperor worked on Maurice. He promised Maurice the Electorate in place of the present Elector; he was to add Magdeburg and Halberstadt to his domain; and neither he nor his people should be subject to the decrees of the Council of Trent. — Maurice is one of the most perplexing characters in Reformation history. There is no reason to doubt that he became a Lutheran by conviction and adhered to that faith to the end; yet he more than anyone else is responsible for the overthrow of his associates in the Schmalkaldic League. Then he became the chief instrument for the restoration of Lutheranism, of securing its public recognition and, in the Religious Peace of Augsburg, 1555, its permanent accreditation, though he died before that date. Lindsay here inserts an interesting note: ⁶

A man's deep religious convictions can tolerate strange company in most ages, and the fact that we find Romanist champions in France plunging into the deepest profligacy the one week and then undergoing the agonies of repentance the next, or that Lutheran leaders combined occasional conjugal infidelities and drinking bouts with zeal for evangelical principles, demands deeper study in psychology than can find expression, in the fashion of some modern English historians, in a few cheap sneers.

War began soon after Luther's death. The time was auspicious. Charles had concluded the Peace of Crespy with France, leaving his English ally in the lurch. Nevertheless, Henry VIII had definitely declared for Catholicism in his Six Articles. The Turks had agreed to a truce. The Pope had been forced to call the Council of Trent. — On July 20, 1546, the Emperor proclaimed the ban of the Empire against Philip of Hesse and John Frederick of Saxony, because

they had repudiated the *Reichskammergericht*, protested against the Diet's recesses, denied the authority of General Councils and of the Emperor himself; to which the Pope added their refusal to acknowledge the Council of Trent.

In spite of the fact that Charles had induced the Elector of Brandenburg and several other princes to remain neutral, the Schmalkaldic League had an army of 50,000 men and 7,000 horse at Donauwoerth on the Danube. Prompt offensive action on their part would probably have ended the war in a short time. But the lack of unity and chronic mutual suspicion interfered (every action of military commanders had to be reported to, and sanctioned by, the headquarters of the League beforehand). They failed to intercept the Emperor's Spanish and Italian troops entering on the south—for fear of antagonizing Bavaria. Then they allowed the Emperor's forces from the Netherlands to cross Germany and join the other troops with very little hindrance.

Then, while they were holding the Emperor in check in the south, Maurice and Ferdinand raided the land of the Elector of Saxony. That effectually broke up the army of the League. It forced the Elector with the main part of the League's army to hasten to the rescue of his own land—enabling Charles to impose terms on the southern cities (except Constance), on the Elector of the Palatinate, Wuerttemberg, and others. In the meantime, John Frederick had not only reconquered his own land, but had taken most of Maurice's Ducal Saxony. But Philip's indecision (he was negotiating for a feasible peace) enabled Charles to move northward rapidly. On April 24, 1547, he routed the Saxon army; took the Elector prisoner; sentenced him to death as a traitor; deprived him of his land, chiefly in favor of Maurice; he was kept a prisoner in the camp before Wittenberg and forced to sign the capitulation of the city which had been ably defended by his wife; she surrendered it to save his life. Philip was induced to surrender by a promise of personal liberty given by Maurice and the Elector of Brandenburg, which, however, was repudiated by the Emperor; perhaps he had never authorized it.

It seemed as though all Germany lay at the Emperor's feet. But it soon became evident that politically he was not much stronger than before. His victory over the Lutherans was a victory for the

Hapsburgs; and the princes were at once "on guard" against the Hapsburg desire for centralization of power in opposition to the territorial jurisdiction of the nobility. At the Diet of Augsburg, September, 1547, they blocked Charles' attempt to make the Empire a reality with an organized military force (they wanted no Spanish veterans in Germany!); to stamp out Lutheranism (they wanted no Spanish Inquisition in Germany!); he could not even make use of the Council for that purpose; the Pope had removed the Council from Trent to Bologna in March, 1547, for the very purpose of keeping it out of the Emperor's hand and subject to his own mastery, and despite Charles' demands he refused to restore it to Trent. In fact, the Pope "had been praying and intriguing, for political and papal reasons, for the success of the Elector against the Emperor" (Mackinnon). Charles had to go his own way.

The result was the attempt to force Charles' own idea of a Confession on Protestant Germany. Like a second Justinian, he appointed Michael Helding, a medieval Catholic; Julius von Pflug, an Erasmian; Agricola, Luther's old antagonist, now court preacher of Joachim II of Brandenburg, to construct the document that came to be known as the Augsburg Interim. It retained the Episcopal office, the seven sacraments, the Mass, the intercession and merits of the saints; it surrendered the absolute supremacy of the Pope over the Church; conceded to Lutherans clerical marriage and Communion in both kinds; it "split the difference" in the doctrine of justification; in fact, all doctrinal statements were ambiguous — were intended to be so! He defied Pope and Council; when the Pope refused to restore it to Trent, he protested against its existence and declared he would not be bound by it.

"Nothing that Charles ever undertook proved such a dismal failure as this patchwork creed made from snippets from two Confessions. However lifeless creeds may become, they all — real ones — have grown out of the living Christian experience of their framers and have contained the very lifeblood of their hearts as well as their brains. It is a hopeless task to construct creeds as a tailor shapes and stitches coats."⁷

But Charles was proud of it. It was to stand, pending the final decision of the council. It was dubiously accepted by the Diet, May 15, 1548. — Three days later Maurice brought in his protest:

He had been promised that his land was not to be subjected to such a change; moreover, his cousin, John Frederick, and his father-in-law, Philip, were still in prison; but Charles had promised not to imprison them; he had it black on white! — Here enters the disputed case of the document referred to: Maurice claimed the Emperor had guaranteed that they should not be kept "in eeniger Haft"; but when brought forth it read: "in ewiger Haft." Was it forged, or did Maurice fail to read it right? Historians are still debating the question.⁸ But Maurice was permitted to change the Augsburg Interim into the Leipzig Interim, December, 1548 ("for which the pusillanimous Melanchthon was largely responsible, and which gave away much that Luther had contended for, except the doctrine of Justification by Faith," Mackinnon).

Then Protestants found that the Interim was to be enforced on them only, not on Catholics. It was imposed on the South German cities despite Charles' definite promise of toleration. Constance was besieged and fell; was deprived of all imperial privileges and added to the Hapsburg possessions. 400 pastors were driven from their homes; many sought refuge in exile; Bucer and Fagius went to England. Churches stood empty. Everywhere in Protestant Germany there was passive resistance — "if singing doggerel verses, publishing satirical songs, pamphlets, even catechisms, cartoons, with an immense circulation, can be called passive." — Duke Christopher of Wuerttemberg was ordered to exile Brenz; he answered that he could not banish his entire population. Many of the North German princes and cities refused to accept the Interim. The example of the imprisoned John Frederick, who decisively rejected it, stalled the opposition. Leaders were Amsdorf, Flacius, Erasmus Alberus, Nicolas Gallus. From Magdeburg ("unsers Herrgotts Kanzlei") they kept up a strenuous and persistent pen warfare. — Charles' creed became a dead letter in most of Germany.

There was added opposition to the Emperor on personal and national grounds. The continued imprisonment of Philip was resented by Maurice. The general soreness was aggravated by the continued presence of Spanish soldiers and ministers in Germany, despite repeated promises to remove them. The renewed efforts of Charles to make the imperial crown hereditary in his family aroused apprehension; he had failed to have his son, the later Philip II, elected as his

successor; the Diet had elected his brother Ferdinand. Now Charles proposed to make his son the successor of his brother, instead of Ferdinand's son Maximilian, who was reputed to be favorably disposed toward Protestants. Added to this was the insolence of Spanish troops in enforcing the Interim; citizens were told: if they did not accept it, they must be taught theology by Spanish soldiers; or, They would yet learn the language of Spain. In the background threatened the dread specter of the Spanish Inquisition. Despite Charles' continued presence in Germany, anarchy increased. Revolt would have come sooner if Protestants had not suspected and hated Maurice. Charles' foreign prestige was waning. France and England had made peace; either one of the two was free to contemplate a move against him — and both had sufficient provocation. England was worried; Edward VI was declining rapidly; everybody knew Mary Tudor's feelings toward Protestants and, when she succeeded Edward, what she was sure to do — under Charles' advice. Charles had several times defeated France; France might try to take revenge. The Turk was on the warpath again.

Maurice, pure opportunist, had played the traitor to Protestantism because it paid him; now it was the Emperor's turn. It will be remembered that Maurice had received Magdeburg and Halberstadt in that ill-famed deal. But Magdeburg had persistently refused to accept the Interim, and Maurice laid siege to the city. But while the siege and fall of this city (November 9, 1551), purely because it refused to bow to religious tyranny, is a final item to be charged against Maurice, it is evident that he himself now became thoroughly alarmed, not only at the vicious way in which Charles wreaked his vengeance on the two imprisoned princes, but chiefly at the arbitrary manner in which he was proceeding to carry out his political aims. While he was ostensibly engaged with the siege of Magdeburg, he plotted with William of Hesse, son of Philip, who stood ready to avenge the wrong done to his father; with Hans of Kuestrin, Albert of Brandenburg-Culmbach, and John Albert of Mecklenburg against the Emperor. He negotiated an active alliance with Henry II of France (Treaty of Chambord and Fredewald, January—February, 1552) which ceded Metz, Toul, and Verdun to France, in return for which Henry invaded Lorraine. Maurice and his confederates suddenly turned on the Emperor, who in utter

self-confidence was resting at the spa in Innsbruck; when he awoke to the danger, it was too late to resist; too late to escape northward (the logical way, through the Netherlands by sea to Spain); Maurice had even begun to block the passes to Italy; if it had not been for a mutiny in his army, which delayed him a few hours, Maurice would have accomplished what he set out to do, "to run the old fox to earth" — Charles would have been a prisoner. As it was, in a litter, in darkness and storm, he escaped ("in Hemd und Struempfen") over the Brenner Pass to Villach (May 18—19, 1552). "It was the road by which he had entered Germany in fair spring weather when he came in 1530, in the zenith of his power, to settle, as he had confidently expected, the religious difficulties in Germany." In Villach he awaited the issue, it seems not particularly downcast, but rather disgruntled; he was a Hapsburg, which was a synonym for stubbornness and the conviction that God had established the "divine right of kings" as a special prerogative of the Hapsburgs. — The Fathers of Trent, fearing Maurice's advance, took to the bushes!

But the victors stopped short of revolution. No wish to depose the fugitive Emperor was voiced; they were ready to negotiate through Ferdinand. In great numbers the princes gathered in Passau in August. Maurice was master of the situation; his troops and those of his "wild ally," Albert Alcibiades of Brandenburg-Culmbach, filled the town, and the assembled princes were uneasy; someone said that many a prince felt "as if they had a hare in their breast." But Maurice was sensible and conservative; his demands were moderate and statesmanlike, aimed at the public good. He asked for the release of his father-in-law Philip; for a permanent settlement of the religious question by a meeting of German princes fairly representative of the two parties — no Council summoned and directed by the Pope, he held, would ever give fair play to the Protestants, nor could they expect to get it from the Diet because the large number of ecclesiastical members gave the Romanist side an undue preponderance — and in this he voiced the conviction of all Protestant and some of the other princes. They adopted what became known as the Treaty of Passau; the imprisoned princes were to be liberated and restored; the Interim was canceled; total religious liberty was to be granted until the religious differences could be

settled by a Diet. This agreement Charles signed. The additional demand that the religious peace should continue even if the Diet should fail to achieve religious unity he refused; obstinately he held to the supremacy of the Diet. Perhaps he still counted on the divisions among the Protestants, thought he could break up this alliance of princes by intrigue, by supporting the "born Elector" against the one whom he himself had created, Maurice. And Maurice himself perhaps feared this; he was satisfied when the "born Elector," John Frederick, consented to the transfer of the electorate to Maurice. This gave Maurice the additional satisfaction of showing his fellow nobles that the "Spaniard" was the only foe of a lasting peace in Germany.

Charles returned to Augsburg, where "he had the petty satisfaction of threatening the Lutheran preachers who had returned, and of again overthrowing the democratic government of the city" (Lindsay). The inveterate Hapsburg! But then, in the attempt to reconquer Metz, he failed miserably against the defense of the city by Francis of Guise; that finally filled him with such disgust that he left all German affairs to his brother and devoted the rest of his active life to Spain, where he had been more successful; he had managed to separate the Netherlands from the Empire and unite them with Spain; his son Philip had married Mary Tudor, Queen of England; hence Spanish ships could henceforth freely use the English Channel and "the harbors and roads of interior Europe" ending in the Low Countries; a combination which made for world domination! It failed because of one Elizabeth who had her own mind and ambitions—but that, too, is another story; Charles did not know that.

Disorders of the times delayed the assembling of a Diet. The old Elector died March 3, 1554, worn out by misfortune and imprisonment. Maurice was killed in a campaign against former fellow conspirator Albert of Culmbach, at Sievershausen, July 9, 1553—only 32 years old. The Diet met February—September, 1555, and there, in the Religious Peace of Augsburg, made the stipulations of the Treaty of Passau law in Germany. The Peace of Augsburg, too, had faults which later on led to greater trouble; but it gave to the Lutheran Church its first legal accreditation in Germany; it assured peace to Germany until it was drawn into the Thirty Years' War,

which started in Bohemia, while other lands were being tortured by religious wars, the result of the Counter Reformation. And the tone for the Augsburg Peace was set by the Treaty of Passau.

St. Louis, Mo.

FOOTNOTES

1. Translation by Mackinnon, *Luther and the Reformation*, IV, 28.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 27.
3. John H. C. Burleigh, University of Edinburgh, in the *Evangelical Quarterly*.
4. H. E. Jacobs, *Martin Luther, the Hero of the Reformation*, p. 331.
5. Cp. A. L. Graebner, "Luther and Landgrave Philip's Double Marriage," *Theol. Quarterly*, IV, pp. 174—196; William Dallmann, "Luther's Connection with the Divorce of Henry VIII of England and the Bigamy of Philip of Hessen," *Theol. Monthly*, V, pp. 40—45.
6. Thomas M. Lindsay, *A History of the Reformation*, I, 384, note.
7. Lindsay, *loc. cit.*, p. 391.
8. Rabelais († 1552) already tells the story in Gargantua, blaming Granvella with the change. *It is said* that Leopold von Ranke credited it; modern historians, as a rule, do not, e. g., Gottlob Egelhaaf, *Landgraf Philipp der Grossmuetige*, Ver. f. Ref. No. 83; A. F. Pollard, *Cambridge Modern History*.

The Basis of Our Faith

By W. F. BECK

NOT IN MAN

WHAT would happen if you did not believe your map, your neighbor, your groceryman, or your doctor? — Faith is the rule of our life. The world believes; it could hardly go on without believing.

There is no unbelief;
Whoever plants a seed beneath the sod
And waits to see it push away the clod,
He trusts in God. — E. Y. CASE.

"The greatest part of our knowledge is implicit faith" (Samuel Johnson). We regularly face problems for which there is no solution except faith. In all important transactions of life we have to take a leap in the dark (William James). An intelligent use of such faith may be a mark of success.

Experience is a dumb, dead thing;
The victory's in believing. — LOWELL.

This kind of faith may resemble, but is not saving faith. Often it is too easygoing and provides happy hunting for "confidence men" in religion.

A careful person insists on evidence. He is critical. He will be interested in the proofs for the existence of God and other apologetic evidence for the Christian faith. He is delighted to see that Christianity has met human needs better than any other religion (the pragmatic evidence) and finds such practical values a potent demonstration of its truth. But we do not reach our Savior along the lines of logic, of premises and inferences. We do not find God at the end of a philosophical search — He is standing on our doorstep. He simply appears in our midst and is accepted for "reasons of the heart" (Pascal) that cannot be tested.

There is the collier's faith, a faith without knowledge, a blind faith. It is a kind of "divine" feeling of being lifted up, often by beautiful words whose meaning is not important. It holds to thin air, floats above reality, and sometimes rather cheerfully looks to the stars — only to fall into a ditch. It needs the weights of truth to pull it down.

But there is also a head knowledge, which leaves the heart cold and dead, without terror of sin or joy of forgiveness. That was the trouble with the scribes who showed the Wise Men the way to Bethlehem but did not go there themselves (Matt. 2:3-6). Later Jesus asked the men at the Temple, "If I tell you the truth, why don't you believe Me?" (John 8:46.)* James (2:19) said: "You believe there is one God. That is good. The devils also believe that — and shudder." Faust (I:412) says, "Die Botschaft hoer' ich wohl, allein mir fehlt der Glaube." We are told of a man who memorized the Bible but did not know the way to heaven. Such knowledge is no nearer heaven than that of a gambler, dreaming of winnings, or that of a modern materialist who knows all pleasures and luxuries from vivid visual portrayals but happens to be without the money to enjoy them. Such religious knowledge condemns a man to loneliness; he is like a rock, chiseled into artistic form, but lying a few feet from the building for which it was intended.

We pastors may relapse into a similar head knowledge. The Emmaus disciples "went back and told the others, but these did not believe them" (Mark 16:13; cp. v. 14). There happens to be no special stately arch of knowledge through which a theologian enters the treasure house of truth. Faith is the only door. A pastor and his layman may differ widely in knowledge; yet each must stoop and believe like a child in order to come to God.

It is even possible to speak well of Jesus (Luke 4:22) without coming to Him. Herod liked to hear John the Baptizer (Mark 6:20). Sergius Paulus "called for Barnabas and Saul and wanted to hear the Word of God" (Acts 13:7). The whole town of Antioch near Pisidia came together to hear the Word (v. 44). And Felix was frightened when Paul spoke to him about the judgment (Acts 24:25). Especially when conscience shows the effectiveness of the Law in men's hearts and the Spirit is perhaps shaking them out of their complacency, they may feel helpless and may tremble without turning to God.

Sometimes faith is based on quasi-miraculous healings, used like

* For approximately fifteen years the author has been working independently in preparing a modern translation of the Bible. All Scripture references in this article are given in the author's version. — F. E. M.

trump cards by the Roman Catholic Church and some evangelists, as a proof of the truth of all that a particular Church teaches. We recognize miracles as secondary evidence. Jesus said, "If you do not trust Me, trust My works" (John 10:38; cp. 5:36; 10:25; 14:10-11; 15:24). But He sharply criticized anyone who waited for supernatural proofs and miracles before he would believe: "If you do not see wonderful proofs and miracles, you will not believe" (John 4:48; cp. v. 39). After the resurrection He told Thomas, "Blessed are those who did not see Me, and yet believed" (John 20:29). Paul says, "If we hope for something that we see, we really do not hope" (Rom. 8:24). That is the official attitude of the Church of Christ toward miracles.

Again, a belief may be based too much on a believer's wish. Caesar (*Gallic War*, III:18) said, "Men willingly believe what they wish." E. Young: "What ardently we wish, we soon believe." H. M. Kallen (*Why Religion*, 1927, p. 88) says of items for which there is little evidence: "As they are precious and desirable and too fleeting and impotent to stay in our environment of themselves, we supply the staying power from our own hearts. What they seem to lack we contribute. And that which we contribute is belief. . . . And it speaks for our desires and our needs, not for the powers of the objects we believe in. We believe also in the objects that impose themselves upon us by their inner force. But our belief in those objects is passive; it is acquiescence, not preference; while our belief in these etherial and passing entities is active, a preference, not acquiescence." Much comfort in trouble, especially at the death of unchristians, is flowery self-persuasion without a basis in fact. We show the same fault when we are "choosy" about the Biblical truths which we accept. We dare not be subjective and arbitrary, making ourselves the judges who decide which voice of God they'll tune in as they read His book. Modernists are trying hard to find a Christ apart from the Bible by shaping Him according to their own ideals, and so they lose both Christ and the Bible (cp. Mark 4:15). Only in heaven shall we see Him without the Bible, "face to face" (1 Cor. 13:12). "If anyone teaches anything else and will not agree with the sound words of our Lord Jesus Christ and godly teaching, he is proud and knows nothing" (1 Tim. 6:3-4). The creations of our own hearts may be a pleasant opiate, but they help no one. We

must clear them away as rubbish and as an abomination in the temple where God's children come to worship.

The unbeliever's difficulty is not that the saving truths are in themselves so incredible; too many absurdities have been held to be true by our gullible race. The real negative to a missionary's invitation is not, "I don't think what you say is true," but, "I don't like it." "The natural man does not welcome the thoughts of the Spirit of God; he thinks they are foolish and cannot understand them, because you must have the Spirit to see their real value" (1 Cor. 2:14). Coupled with his dislike is the prospect's inability to change his habits organized in opposition to God. "The mind of the flesh hates God. It refuses to obey the Law of God, because it cannot obey it" (Rom. 8:7; cp. 1 Cor. 1:23). "The desires of the flesh are against the Spirit" (Gal. 5:27).

So our natural ways to save ourselves must fail and come to nothing. "The wise will be ashamed; they will be dumbfounded and taken; they have rejected the Word of the Lord. And what wisdom have they?" (Jer. 8:9; cp. Micah 3:7.) The false ways may multiply for people who do not accept God's way. "For that reason God sends them a strong delusion so they will believe a lie" (2 Thess. 2:11). All human ways of believing fail to please God (Heb. 11:6), since they are the hopeless ways of works. "There is a curse on all who depend on doing what the Law says" (Gal. 3:10). Without believing in Christ there is no hope. "You were then without Christ. . . . You were without hope or God in the world" (Eph. 2:12). "If you do not believe that I am He, you will die in your sins" (John 8:24).

The origin and basis of Christian faith is —

IN GOD

"When the right time came, God sent His Son, born of a woman, born under the Law, to free us who were under the Law and to make us His sons" (Gal. 4:4-5). "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners" (1 Tim. 1:15). He says, "I am the living Bread that came down from heaven. . . . The bread that I will give is My flesh, which I give for the life of the world." (John 6:51.) "God made Him who did not know sin to be sin for us that we in Him

should be made the righteousness of God." "God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself by not counting their sins against them." (2 Cor. 5:21, 19.)

Jesus "finished" the task of our salvation (John 19:28, 30); no other saving action is needed. Jesus is the Way, Truth, Life, Bread, Water, Light of the world (John 14:6; 6:35; 4:14; 8:12). The righteousness, which God planned, in Christ prepared, and by His verdict made our own, is far better than the best that men could do (see Matt. 5:20). God saw that it was good. John the Baptizer is "to tell His people their sins are forgiven and they can be saved" (Luke 1:77; cp. Col. 2:13; Heb. 1:3; 1 John 1:7; 2:1-2).

God tells us about all that He has prepared for us, and when He speaks, He gives. His Word contains and brings Christ (John 5:39; 17:8), the λόγος, who became flesh (John 1:1-2, 14), who suffered, died, and rose again. His Word is an expansion of the heavenly message: "Your Savior, who is Christ the Lord, was born today" (Luke 2:11). That was Paul's message: "While I was with you, I was determined to know only Jesus Christ, and Him Crucified" (1 Cor. 2:2); "I brought to you what I have received — it is most important — that Christ died for our sins" (1 Cor. 15:3; cp. John 20:31; Acts 20:24). And in this Christ God gives us everything.

We can see what God gives us by contrasting what we are and have before and after conversion:

Forgiven

	Before	After
John 3:6	a child of flesh	a child of God
Ezek. 11:19	a stony heart	a heart of flesh
Rom. 6:13; Eph. 2:5	dead in sin	living in righteousness
Rom. 6:6; 7:25	a slave of sin	a servant of God

Free

Col. 1:13; Acts 26:18	under the tyranny of darkness	in the kingdom of God's Son
John 1:17; Rom. 6:14	under the Law	under love
Heb. 9:14	a bad conscience	a good conscience
Rom. 5:1	quarreling with God	at peace with God
Rom. 8:7, 28	hating God	loving God
Gal. 3:10-14	under the curse	under God's blessing
Gen. 3:8; Eph. 2:12-18	fleeing from God	coming to God

God's Own

1 Pet. 2:25	a lost sheep	under the Shepherd
Matt. 6:31-32	subject to any misfortune	under the Father's protection
Rom. 8:35-37	defeated	victorious
Eph. 2:12; 4:4	despairing	hopeful
Titus 3:3-7	an heir of hell	an heir of heaven

I ask you, how can a creed which gives all that be called a burden by men who boast of their free mind as they deny what God says and of their courage as they reject what God gives? Or how can we pastors as carriers of such priceless gifts ever do the least of our task with a sour face?

Unbelief forfeits all of this (Luke 7:30), returns to chains and slavery, to eat its own bitter damnation. "He came to His own, and His own people did not accept Him. But to all who accepted Him and believe in His name He gave the right to become children of God." (John 1:11-12.) By believing we accept God's gifts, particularly His righteousness. "We are considered righteous if we believe in Him who raised from the dead our Lord Jesus, who was put to death for our sins and was raised to declare us righteous" (Rom. 4:24-25; cp. 10:9).

Paul says that the righteousness which God gives is intended for faith (*εἰς πίστιν*, Rom. 1:17), as food is intended for the mouth and air for the lungs. Righteousness fits faith as a kernel fits its shell. It does not fit anyone who trusts in himself, but it exactly meets the need of him who, despairing of his good works, believes. Righteousness finds an exact counterpart in faith, because faith lacks merit; it is like a good auditorium which has no echo or noise of its own to compete with the speaker's voice.

Faith fits righteousness, because faith can take what is invisible. The blood of the Passover was painted on the lintel and the doorposts. The Israelite who celebrated the festival within his home most likely could not see the blood. We cannot see our righteousness, but God can; and that is enough for faith.

God chose the way of faith, because He wanted to reach every kind of person (Ezek. 33:11; 1 Tim. 2:4): the thief and the Apostle, the failure and the success, the poor and the rich, the weak and the mighty, the simple and the learned — righteousness by faith, a most democratic leveler of people, fits everyone of them.

Faith is produced by His Word, which is a promise (Ps. 119: 49-50; Rom. 4:18-22) and a gift of power (John 11:43; 1 Cor. 1:18; Heb. 4:12). Commanded by God, Moses raises his rod over the Red Sea, and the waters part; Joshua and Israel march around Jericho, and its walls collapse. No one who took Jesus at His word ever failed. He told the King's officer, "'Go. Your son lives.' The man believed what Jesus told him and went." (John 4:50.) Peter says, "Because You say so, I will let down the nets" (Luke 5:5). "Just say a word," says the Roman captain (Matt. 8:8). In His Word, God has chosen to reveal His mighty arm (Is. 53:1).

By such a power the Word creates faith in us. We are the "people who through their [the disciples'] Word believe in Me" (John 17:20). "If you tell people about Christ, they will hear, and such hearing produces faith" (Rom. 10:17; cp. Jer. 31:34; Col. 1:6). We serve as carriers of this mighty Word. "Who is Apollos now? Or who is Paul? Men by whose help you came to believe, and each of us has only what the Lord gave him" (1 Cor. 3:5).

We cannot be proud as though we had produced faith in ourselves or in others. "I do not mean that we can do anything by ourselves or can claim that anything came from us, but God gives us our ability" (2 Cor. 3:5). "When I spoke and preached, I did not use words of wisdom to persuade you, but I let the Spirit and His power prove the truth to you in order that your faith may not depend on the wisdom of men but on the power of God" (1 Cor. 2:4-5; cp. 12:3). God works faith in us. "A person can come to Me only if the Father who sent Me draws him" (John 6:44; cp. v. 65). When the Christians in Jerusalem had heard Peter's report about Cornelius, they praised God, saying, "Then God has given repentance also to the people who are not Jews that they may live" (Acts 11:18). God says, "I will take the stony heart out of their bodies and give them a heart of flesh" (Ezek. 11:19; cp. Jer. 31: 18-19). "It was given to you . . . to believe in Christ" (Phil. 1:29). It is "Jesus who has given us our faith and makes us perfect in it" (Heb. 12:2). "The Good News we brought to you did not prove to be only words, but it carried power and the Holy Spirit and a full conviction" (1 Thess. 1:5). So we see "how immeasurably great is His power working in us who believe" (Eph. 1:19; cp. Phil.

2:13). Luther says: "When God creates faith in a man, it is as great an accomplishment as if He created heaven and earth again" (Walch IX:972).

The impulse to bring God and us together comes from God. We flee. God pursues us, overcomes the distance, and breaks through the opposition in order to bring us back. His loving capture makes us willing to surrender. His mercy, challenging and pulling us, makes us want to come to Him. His drawing becomes our seeking; His giving, our taking; His asking, our "yes"; His assurance, our "Amen."

Christian truth is not something that we try to make ourselves believe; it is a message which we find we cannot disbelieve. God pours His love into our hearts (Rom. 5:5) with an urgency that we cannot escape. Test it by reading John 3 or chapters 14—17, and after each section say to yourself, "It isn't true." It just can't be done. This inner compulsion, which overwhelms us, is the certainty of faith.

Our surrender to the truth is not a sullen submission. Tasting God's mercy, we are really persuaded. We see the Savior's gentle way in the words: "I gave them the words You gave Me, and they learned the truth that I came from You, and they believe that You sent Me" (John 17:8).

As we believe what God tells us about His Son (1 John 5:9-10), we become righteous. "This righteousness of God comes without the Law to all who believe, just by their believing in Jesus Christ" (Rom. 3:22; cp. Is. 45:24-25; Rom. 3:25-26; 4:5; 10:4, 10; Gal. 2:16; 3:8, 22; Phil. 3:9; Heb. 11:7). We are now "holy sinners": There was nothing in us to which we could point and say, "Here I did not need forgiveness"; now there is nothing to which we could not point and say, "It is holy." Luther expresses this thought in his classic axiom: *Christianus est simul iustus et simul peccator*.

"His love saved you through faith; you didn't do it—it is the gift of God" (Eph. 2:8). "I am not ashamed of the Good News, because it is God's power to save everyone who believes it" (Rom. 1:16).

Real faith is always individual faith. The salvation which God has prepared for all (John 1:29; 3:16; 2 Cor. 5:19; 1 Tim. 2:6) reaches its goal only when an individual says, "I believe." Then the

universal fact of the salvation of the human race becomes a personal, intellectual and emotional, bond between a man and his God.

In Luther's time and before that, men who had lived an evil life and were afraid to die would send to a monastery for a monk's garb in which they wanted to be buried. — Ah Koh, the Chinese postman in an inland city of China, handed out the letters to the missionary. As he did so, he bemoaned the feebleness of his advancing years; then remarked, "Oh, well, it will not be long before I am in my heavenly home." "But, Ah Koh," objected the missionary, "you have not accepted Christ. How can you expect to reach heaven?" The old man responded hopefully, "Surely, after I've brought letters to you all these years, one of you will get me in." — A banker once answered my invitation by saying, "My wife has religion enough for both of us." Men can be led by other believers to believe, but they cannot depend on them to believe for them. Laymen cannot be at ease because their pastor has a fine conviction or because the church to which they belong is sound. Belief that isn't individual is unbelief.

We may have our difficulties with the threefold description of faith: knowledge, assent, trust. We may have knowledge and assent without faith; but trust always includes knowledge and assent. The devil can say, "Christ is a Savior"; only a Christian can say, "Christ is my Savior." If assent means, "It is true," then trust means, "It is true for me." Knowledge = the story of Jesus; certainty = it is true that Jesus saves; trust = He saves me. A child is in the upper room of a burning house. A strong man stands below and calls, "Drop into my arms." The child may be convinced that the man is there and he is strong; but the essence of faith is to drop into his arms. Whenever a term means the personal acceptance of the Savior, it means faith. In the following, "knowing" is "believing": "I know that my Redeemer lives" (Job 19:25); "My sheep know Me" (John 10:14); "to know You and Jesus Christ whom You sent is everlasting life" (17:2; cp. 6:69; Gal. 4:8-9; Phil. 3:8; 1 Tim. 2:4).

Faith is a simple thing, a child's hand. The Bible tells us very little about the faith of infants. But Jesus took a child, set him before the disciples, and said, "Be like that" (Matt. 18:1-10; 19:13-15; Luke 18:15-17). Luke tells us about the faith of John the Baptizer

before he was born (Luke 1:15, 41). A child's faith can be unconscious, but we do not call it inactive or potential; that would idealize the faith of an adult. It is a simple act, perhaps like a thought before you reflect on it. A little girl looks at a picture of Jesus blessing little children, and, pointing to the one in His arms, she says, "That's me." You look at Peter being rescued from the waters and say, "That's I," or, "I believe that Jesus Christ . . . is my Lord."

God's way of salvation by faith is for simple people. A Greek philosopher is supposed to have written over his door, "None but the learned may enter here." But over the Door of Christ there is written: "Let children and simple people come to Me." Jesus said, "Knock." If the door were heavily locked, an expert with special tools might be needed to open it. But a dumb man, a blind man, a fool, can knock; one who cannot read or write can knock. Remember what one poor woman did. She did not take hold of Christ with her hands or throw her arms around His knees; she stretched out her fingers, and then she did not touch Christ's feet or even His dress, but the tassel of His garment; and she was made well (Luke 8:43-44). What she did was simplicity itself. She merely touched the tassel. You can be saved without saying a word. Just believe, take Him, if not with a hand's clasp, then with a finger's touch, and live. The remedy against death in the desert was a simple thing (Num. 21:4-9). Moses didn't say, "Bow down several times before this copper serpent." He didn't make patients touch it or apply it to their wounds. They were to look. What could be easier? The brazen serpent could be seen from different parts of the camp, and however far away the dying person might be, Moses said, "Look." A glance from the distance brought healing. When the sun sank and darkness came, the snake on the pole might be seen only dimly; it didn't matter: The sick man was to do what he was told — look at it in the dusk; it would be as effective as in the light. And a blind man might turn sightless eyeballs toward the Cross of Jesus and see nothing; yet if he looked, he would live. Just look, and you will live.

St. Louis, Mo.

Inside Missouri Synod

By JAMES R. BLACKWOOD

EDITORIAL PREFACE

This article appeared in the Spring issue of *Religion in Life*, and with the kind permission of the publishers we are able to present it in our journal. By and large the author's analysis is very much to the point. It is, of course, impossible for an "outsider" to catch the real "inside" of another church body. There are certain intangibles in every denomination which only the members of the denomination can understand and appreciate. After all, one must breathe the very air of a denomination if one wishes to evaluate it from all possible angles. We believe that such an intangible of the Missouri Synod is its solidarity, unity of purpose, loyalty to its traditions. The "outsider" probably cannot escape observing this characteristic, but to truly understand and fully appreciate it, one must experience it by actual participation, for example, in the recently completed "Conquest for Christ," one of the greatest demonstrations of Synod's inner cohesion in its long history. It is indeed difficult to explain what prompts nearly 5,000 congregations, each a champion of the principle of the sovereignty and autonomy of the local congregation, cheerfully to submerge their local interests for the sake of a Synod-wide undertaking. — But there is one Missourian characteristic in particular which appears enigmatic to the "outsider." The author of this article refers to what in his opinion is an irreconcilable clash between Missouri's doctrine of the *Una Sancta* and its practice in the area of outward fellowship. The "outsider" finds it difficult to understand how a Missourian can speak in such glowing terms of the ecumenical character of the *Una Sancta* and actually confess in the Augustana that this alone is the true Church, and at the same time remain aloof from all current ecumenical movements. In his bewilderment he will ask: Is the Missourian's praise of the *Una Sancta* only lip service? is his *Lebrgerechtigkeit* merely an evidence of spiritual pride and therefore just as damnable as *Werkgerechtigkeit*? Or is he obsessed with the idea that in an age of unionism the *raison d'être* of Missouri is an extreme form of separation and complete isolationism? In a characterization of his own Church the Episcopalian Bishop Angus Dun said that in the eyes of the Protestant Churches the Episcopalians appear to be like the household in which some members stand at the front door cordially inviting the guests to enter, while other members of the same household stand at the second-story window pouring ice-cold water on the guests. Does this apply to Missouri? A careful examination of Missouri's ecclesiology shows that there is positively no clash between Missouri's doctrinal position and its practice. Missouri exemplifies a theology which — in the words of a German observer — aptly unites "*Aengstlichkeit um die reine Lehre*" and "*weltumfassende Liebe*," a narrow conscience in matters of doctrine and a broad spirit in matters of love. Faith in the power of the Gospel and love toward every member of the *Una Sancta* throughout the wide, wide world prompt the Missourian to share the Gospel in a true *koinonia* with every Christian. This same faith and love prompt him to say with Luther: "Cursed be that union and fellowship by which the Gospel is endangered" ("*periclitatur*"). For every aberration in Christian doctrine may become a fatal snare for the brother whom Christ has bought with His precious blood. For the sake of God's truth — which never becomes ours to do with as we will — and for the sake of the fellow member in Christ — within or without our own denominational body — separation may become necessary. Reformed theology has an entirely different approach to the

doctrines of the Church and the means of grace, and its adherents are apt to interpret our separation as separatism; at any rate, our position appears to be enigmatic. Probably the article will serve the purpose that we Missourians ask ourselves whether we clearly understand our own position, whether we have always presented it convincingly, and, above all, whether we have always found the golden mean between a real concern for the purity of the Gospel and true love toward all members of the *Una Sancta*. F. E. M.

FROM what other people had told me, my mental picture of a Missouri Lutheran once took shape as a sort of scaly monster belching fire.

But I have changed my mind in the last five years, since I have set out in my first charge, a Presbyterian minister in the thick of Missouri Lutherans. One day early in my pastorate I wanted to look up a reference in a certain volume of theology. The public library of nearby St. Louis did not have a copy of the book. What about Concordia Seminary? Perhaps the Lutherans would let me use their library, perhaps not. It was worth trying. Although I did not find the book in question, I found something far more interesting. People. Friendly people. Missouri Lutherans.

A professor who saw me browsing introduced himself, and asked what had brought me to Concordia. Later on he said that the Seminary had recently opened its doors to men outside the Missouri Synod. I decided to go through that open door and look around.

Ever since then I have been looking and listening, and sometimes talking, one morning a week at Concordia. My work at the Seminary has dipped into various departments — Old Testament, New Testament, systematic and practical theology. If the teachers, pastors, and students whom I have met represent Missouri Synod Lutherans, present and future tenses, they have been strangely misjudged by men of other denominations who have talked with me about them. The classes have drawn together recent graduates of the Seminary, pastors of Lutheran churches in and around St. Louis, and a smattering of non-Lutherans like myself. Most of these other men face problems like my own. For their casual conversation, I find it hard to distinguish them from the ministers of my own wing of Protestant life. They smoke a lot, but they don't belch fire.

What's more, I have discovered that Missouri Lutheran students belong to a community of thought in their scholarship. Our reading lists have seemed to me anything but provincial. On a random sample, I think of assignments in the works of J. S. Stewart, John Baillie, H. R. Macintosh, Aulén and Nygren, Kraemer, Barth and Brunner, the Niebuhrs, Tillich, Latourette, Lewis Sherrill, and Santayana. The

Missouri Lutherans keep up with what others are writing. It is only an acquaintance on paper, to be sure, yet it is genuine. Consequently the young man from Concordia who takes graduate work at another seminary not only keeps pace with his class; whether it be at Union or Chicago or elsewhere, he often goes to the front in scholarship.

Whether or not they know it, these men often talk about four subjects that bear on what they think of other denominations, and what people in other denominations assume (and too frequently say) about Missouri Lutherans.

I

The first of these subjects is *education*. "The school," declared Luther, "must be the next thing to the church." A Missouri Lutheran congregation maintains a parochial school near the sanctuary wherever it can swing finances. They have invested heavily in their educational program. In the United States the synod has more than 1,200 parochial schools, with enrollment pushing 100,000; ten prep schools and junior colleges; two normal schools to feed into the parochial system; and two seminaries. Concordia Seminary, on a beautiful campus six miles from the heart of St. Louis, enrolls about six hundred students. It ranks among the largest Protestant seminaries in this country.

But notice what may happen with such a system of education. A boy may skip off to kindergarten, and finish his course years later, a slightly bald scholar holding the Doctor of Theology degree — without once having gone outside Lutheran schools for his instruction! True, the system pays huge dividends in leadership. Many of the students later go into the pastorate or parochial teaching, the mission field, publication or religious radio. One of my friends, who is by no means an exception, had decided at the age of twelve to enter the ministry. Learning the catechisms, singing Reformation chorales, studying German, Latin, and Greek, all pointed him toward the pulpit. When he came to seminary, he knew Martin Luther forward and backward. But he knew more of what Luther said about the Turks than what John Wesley said about God. He knew Calvin best at those points where Lutherans have attacked him. He knew the intimate life of other Christian bodies only from the outside and from a distance. The system of education helps to explain why a good many Missouri Lutherans have had very little contact with others who are "not of this fold." Quite simply, they had no place to get acquainted.

Furthermore, the system of religious education has depended rather heavily on the *memoriter* method. Partly for this reason younger Missouri Lutherans are likely to sound very much alike when they begin

to talk religion. When the student reaches seminary, he can tell you this or that doctrine without fumbling; except that he finds it next to impossible to tell you in his own words. When he begins to preach and wants to quote a text, he almost always fetches one of the proof-texts from the standards of his church. Homiletically, he is apt to follow the traditional pattern set by the doctrine of Law and Grace, without a glimmer of hope till near the middle of the sermon; and sometimes not even then. He is likely to use the stock illustration of his forebears: a sailing vessel at sea, wrenched by waves, lashed by wind — familiar and terrifying to his grandfather, or great-grandfather who ventured in faith across the sea, but considerably less vivid to farmers, merchants, laborers, and housewives of inland America today.

Lest anyone think that these words cut too sharply, let me explain that I am acting as a reporter, not as a critic. I have been quoting, indirectly, what a few thoughtful Missouri Lutherans have said about themselves and their ways of educating for the ministry. The seminary professor knows what obstacles he must overcome to bring the gospel alive to living men. Students seem eager for a vernacular expression of their problems and their faith. They discuss theological questions freely among themselves. One Lutheran student said to an outsider, "Tell us what you think; we may be wrong." Such frankness gives one clear sign of hope that things are changing, educationally and otherwise, inside Missouri Synod. Results may be long in coming, but they are on the way.

II

The second problem area centers in the question of *Church and State*. Almost every Missouri Lutheran pastor has had Romans 13:1 drilled into him since childhood. "The powers that be are ordained of God." When a pastor refers to the text, he usually gives only the number. Largely on the strength of "Romans 13," the synod has kept out of civil affairs. Yet many pastors are now raising uneasy queries. What are "the powers"? Where do you find them? In a structure of government? In chosen rulers? In the people? Are the powers a vague spiritual penumbra brooding over the council tables of the world? Why should a pastor cast a secret ballot, and yet shy away from other citizens who think as he does?

In a gathering of Missouri Lutheran pastors, such questions raise the temperature of the conversation by several degrees. But the word "relevant" has seeped into their vocabulary, and they cannot altogether deny the relevance of religious life to civic affairs. The two areas may not be concentric, but they do overlap.

Since the turn of the century members of the Missouri Synod have taken several hard jolts in their view of church and state. For one thing, Lutheran churches in America have always felt a close tie with corresponding parts of the Mother Church in Germany. At the time of World War I over-zealous Americans charged Lutherans here with belonging to "the Kaiser's church." How those words stung! Missouri Lutherans gave their allegiance to the government of the United States of America. They sent young men into the armed forces. They bought bonds. Not only so, but the shock of war changed a large segment of their church from a German-speaking into an English-speaking body.

In 1917 the men of synod revised their constitution. They took the old name, *Die Deutsche Evangelisch-Lutherische Synode von Missouri, Ohio, und andern Staaten*, dropped *Deutsche*, and translated all they had left into the official name, The Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States. Originally the seminaries had insisted that "the German language be and remain the sole and only medium of instruction." Nowadays English claims first place. A professor still can get a laugh by telling a joke in German; but he does well to add a gloss in English. Up to the present day a good many pastors hold services in German; but they do so at an early hour, and generally to dwindling numbers. A shift in language did not come easily, yet if it caused old-timers to wag their heads, in the long view the change has meant an increased yield for the transplanted church.

Again in 1933 and following years, ties with German Lutheranism felt the strain of international events. Some Lutheran pastors in Germany agreed to a conspiracy of silence with National Socialism. They had a text for self-defense — "the powers that be" — and no one could very well deny that the Nazi power had come into being. Yet a few men, like Dietrich Bonhoeffer, called Hitler's bluff; and in so doing they gained the respect of freedom-loving people everywhere. They too had a text. "I am the Lord thy God. Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Suppose a state threatens the church by gagging its ministers and persecuting its members; do churchmen then have the right to speak out, resist? Most Missouri Lutherans — not all, but most, I believe — now answer this question emphatically: YES.

A more immediate problem of church and state has to do with the Roman Catholics. For a long time congressmen in Washington have felt the pressure of a demand for federal aid to parochial schools. It is no secret who wants that aid. Most Lutheran educators have said, "We will get along without it." Although here and there in Europe Lutheranism remains a state-supported religion, in America the Mis-

souri Synod has traditionally stood for separation of church and state. Now what if Roman Catholics jockey for position with the government? Will no Lutheran protest? Will only Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, atheists, and crackpots make a noise? Roman Catholic maneuvers have hit Missouri Lutherans hard, with the result that the Lutherans are keeping sharp watch on what happens under the Capitol dome.

As a matter of fact, the synod has posted an unofficial observer in Washington. If pending legislation looks at all suspicious, this man spreads the word. On the issue of President Truman's nominating an ambassador to the Vatican, people within the Missouri Synod have spoken clearly and forcefully. They have attended mass meetings, sent messages to congressmen, sounded off, and in general behaved like healthy partisans. But even in a mass meeting they are careful to speak as "individual citizens" rather than as members of an ecclesiastical body. While they admit that they sometimes take action, Missouri Lutherans hesitate to modify the noun *action* with the adjective *political*.

As long ago as 1890 a Missouri Lutheran convention declared their church to be "in conscience bound" to fight legislation that might be used to hold back the work of "extending and perpetuating the Kingdom of God." They have learned how to stand fast against what they consider an outside threat; perhaps in time they will come to plan more closely with others in the creative task of shaping a Christian social order.

III

The Missouri Synod stands apart on a third point, *doctrine and worship*. In its very first year the synod plunged into a debate on the nature of the Church and the office of the Christian ministry. Then their debates widened in scope so as to drag out, call by name, and quash Arminians, Socinians, Calvinists and crypto-Calvinists, Donatists, Pelagians, semi-Pelagians, Pelagian-synergists, ordinary synergists, rationalists, and blasphemers. The list includes just about everyone except Missouri Lutherans.

Yet in my years at Concordia Seminary, I have never heard a student or professor, pastor or adherent, express bitterness toward any church or church leader outside Missouri Synod. That is a big statement, especially against such a background, but it is literally true. When these followers of Luther take issue with Calvin they somehow manage to smile. Lecturing one day on theology, a professor said: "Of course we believe in the sovereignty of God" — then looking my

way he added, "only not so much as Presbyterians." The class laughed. Whatever the attitude may have been in the past or continues to be in some parts of synod, the men who now teach at the seminary reason their judgments with charity. They talk doctrine without screaming. Their criticism rises above sarcasm. These men are kind.

Missouri Lutherans are taking new interest in the doctrine of the Body of Christ. The synod has never claimed to be God's only channel of blessing in America. Pastor Grabau of the Buffalo Synod once tried to convince the brethren from Missouri that "external fellowship with the visible orthodox (*i. e.*, *Lutheran*) Church is necessary for salvation." The furor that he stirred up lasted from 1849 until about 1866. The Missouri Synod came to understand that in modern times many believers, like the seven thousand unknown to Elijah, have not bowed down to Baal. Though separated in creed they are united in faith. Moreover, anyone who wants to make communion with a visible church necessary for salvation at the same time denies the article on justification by faith alone.

Later on Dr. A. L. Graebner of Concordia Seminary defined the church as "the community of the regenerate, or of all those who believe in Christ and are justified by faith. . . ." Even a church contaminated by erroneous doctrine may take its place in the Body of Christ, said Graebner, so long as it sets in operation the essentials of the gospel.

Theologians of the Missouri Synod have said good strong words about the *Una Sancta*, the one, holy, catholic, apostolic Church. Then why did the synod fail to send a representative to the 1948 assembly of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam? For what possible reason did the synod keep its men at home when the National Council of Churches came to birth at Cleveland? Strange doings for those who believe in the *Una Sancta*!

One who sits on the sidelines has a hard time knowing exactly what goes on when the Missouri Lutherans huddle, but this fact comes out: they differ strongly over "unionism." The term "unionism" carries a sinister suggestion; it includes what outsiders call the ecumenical movement. Anti-unionists think it foolish to pretend that agreement exists where it does not exist, by holding conferences and hearing speeches and signing documents. They say that fellowship in worship becomes possible only among those who thoroughly agree in doctrine. Union must follow unity—not the other way around. Worshipers therefore can really share the bread and wine of communion—the

vital point—only as they agree on the meaning of the elements. In brief, that is the argument. Until fundamental agreement exists all the running back and forth to conferences doesn't amount to pigtracks in the Ozarks.

Those who advance this argument leave many non-Lutheran Protestants baffled. How will agreement ever come to those who never, never talk over their differences? Do Missouri Lutherans have anything to contribute by way of testimony or scholarship to the rest of us? Is our ignorance invincible? Is their purity of doctrine to be kept immaculate because we cannot be persuaded of its truth, or simply because, like Sainte-Beuve, these good people fear "the Anglo-Saxon contagion"? Are the Augsburg Confession and Luther's catechism infallible? If not, why act as if they were so?

Obviously a good share of the problem lies in the constitution of the Missouri Synod, adopted in 1847. At that time Lutheranism had fractured into some twenty corporate bodies in America; the forming of the *Synode von Missouri* brought a merger of separate groups and unattached congregations. Their doctrine focused in the Word of God as interpreted by the three Ecumenical Creeds, the unaltered Augsburg Confession, the Smaldcald Articles, the Large and the Small Catechism of Luther, and the Formula of Concord. The synod was emerging out of conflict; its members put up sturdy guards against error.

Thus the constitution disavows "unionism of every description." The ruling of 1847, still in force, specifically forbids a pastor to serve any congregation made up of members holding different confessions as such; forbids him to take part in any rite or service with a minister from another denomination; forbids him to join in any kind of religious instruction, mission work, or publication with members of heterodox bodies. Some of the Missouri Lutherans like that part of their constitution. Some do not. At any rate, all ordained men in the synod have pledged themselves to uphold the constitutional government of the church. Critics of Catholicism, they have strict press censorship and an *imprimatur* of their own. Disciples of liberty, they are hemmed in on every side.

Will new leaders shape a freer policy? (I do not mean looser doctrine.) Until they do, these people have the sense to keep their differences of opinion to themselves. The constitution half explains the well-known statement that "every major denomination except the Southern Baptist and Missouri Lutheran" was represented at the first session of the National Council of Churches in Cleveland. I sense a growing belief among men of the synod, however, that plain friend-

liness and straightforward discussion with outsiders need not mean heresy or weakening of principle. Since the Kingdom of God extends beyond the geographical and jurisdictional bounds of the Missouri Synod, earnest Christians should be able to meet and work together at a common task.

IV

The fourth point leads us to think of *evangelism*. The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod — has grown and is growing rapidly. It has spread far beyond the states that fostered its early life. At present the synod reaches into Maine, Florida, California — in fact, into every one of the forty-seven states outside of Missouri! Expansion has come by birth rate and nurture from within the church; by adding members from traditions other than the Lutheran; and by taking in people from the highways and hedges of secularism. Missouri Lutherans have dared to experiment with new techniques for attracting unchurched people to their congregations. The experiments have proved successful.

For example, radio has played a large part in evangelizing men and women ordinarily beyond the range of local churches. Whenever I see the tower of Station KFUD pointing high up from the Concordia campus, I ask myself where the rest of us Protestants have been dozing for the last few decades. We have nearly missed the opportunity of a century while these Lutherans have been broadcasting from their own station day by day since 1924. Then, too, they have built up a national network for their religious programs. Backed financially by a laymen's league, Missouri Lutherans have paid full professional rates for their time on the air. They have also strengthened the synod's missionary appeal in South America with regular broadcasts in Spanish and Portuguese.

This link with radio has become so strong that the Missouri Synod has tried to shake off its local name by advertising itself simply as "The Church of the Lutheran Hour." For sixteen and a half years the radio mission, "Bringing Christ to the Nations," presented a speaker heard by more people than George Whitefield, Charles G. Finney, J. Wilbur Chapman, and Billy Sunday taken together. The emphasis in radio has been vigorously evangelistic from the start; and it has brought results.

In much the same way, Missouri Lutherans are appealing to unchurched people through contemporary architecture. The modern trend shows up in the construction of schools. No more money for crockets and finials — the style functions! Similarly, more and more new church buildings break from the pseudo-Gothic vogue, and say something

with brick and steel and glass that belongs peculiarly to our day. After worshipping in a Missouri Lutheran church designed by the elder Saarinen, one man exclaimed: "It makes me want never to see a fake 'rose window' again." This building lets God's sunlight in!

Granted, a person who has worshiped all his life long in Gothic grandeur or in dim Byzantine abysses may find the new architecture bewildering, a little queer. But to one whose feelings have not been so conditioned the newer style looks inviting. In plain terms, a church that builds along contemporary lines may have a good tool for evangelism; it brings people there to see, and keeps them there to hear. As the synod took a chance on broadcasting twenty-eight years ago, more than one congregation is taking its long chance now on a dynamic architecture. In ways that suit modern needs, Missouri Lutherans are striving to "say Christ so that men understand." For the church itself is functional, interested in seeing gains.

V

The Missouri Synod has come a long way since 1847, when a number of Saxon immigrants formed a new religious body in America, wondering if they could rightly call that body a church. For the most part these folk settled in "islands of Lutheranism." C. F. W. Walther, Wilhelm Sihler, and others with them had left Germany for conscience' sake; they had turned from pietism and had revolted from rationalism. Desiring to reform the church, they bent every effort toward making confessional Lutheranism take root in American soil. They first organized their synod in protest against revivalism, unionism, and new methods.

Ironically, however, the synod has taken over most of the new methods that have become available to the church in the past century—Sunday school, visual aids, modern techniques in sound reproduction, and on and on. Missouri Lutherans have changed their language; they are drastically changing their ways in education; their experiments in architecture, just beginning, but striking close to the center in a new building on the Concordia Seminary campus, make nonconfessional mossbacks sit up and blink their eyes. In outlook and method the synod truly has come a long way during the past hundred years.

Of course some people say that the Missouri Synod still has a long way to go in relationship to other churches. None the less, their isolationism has been challenged. During World War II, 236 chaplains from the Missouri Synod ministered to all kinds of Protestants in the armed forces. (*Nihil obstat*: a battalion is not a congregation.) It

would be interesting to know whether or not any one of these chaplains served communion without cross-examining the communicants on the Augsburg Confession. Yes, or no, many a chaplain must have searched his own heart, asking this question: "Do I have the right to withhold the Body and Blood of Christ from a dying man? 'Who art thou that judgest?'"

There in extreme form is the Missouri Lutheran dilemma. The chaplains have faced it, and it has left its mark on them.

Numerous tokens of late reveal changing attitude among the Missouri Lutherans. After much discussion the synod has finally established "pulpit and altar fellowship" with the American Lutheran Church. [?] During and after the war, members of the synod have given money and clothing to Church World Service, an interdenominational agency. In November, 1951, Missouri Lutherans of the greater St. Louis area took part in the National Teaching Mission, an interdenominational religious census. Pastors and laymen are appearing at meetings they would scarcely have thought of attending a few years ago. Some of the men in key positions are looking for wider areas of co-operation, for as one of them has openly declared, "The island of Lutheranism in America has been destroyed." A new spirit has begun to move across the synod, and it is possible, rather probable, that the next fifty years will bring changes as significant as those that have come in the past century.

Since 1847 the Missouri Synod has grown from a few scattered congregations into a body reporting care over nearly two million souls; and it still is growing. Indeed, some leaders of the synod have begun to worry about its growth. Will new members cling to old ways? Will they remember former associations? Above all, will evangelistic zeal perhaps dangerously weaken the church by coaxing into its membership thousands of religious "floaters" who do not have their doctrinal roots in Lutheranism? Such a thing may happen. It seems more likely, however, that these men and women will offer a testimony that all Protestants need to hear in our time. Through them may come acquaintance and sympathy, and an easier yoke to bind us as laborers together under God.

WEEKLY OUTLINES TO BE RESUMED IN NEXT ISSUE

With the July issue the publication of weekly sermon outlines, suspended for some years in favor of monthly sermon studies or longer *Studien*, will be resumed. The Synodical Conference Epistles, as published in the Concordia memorandum booklet, will be the texts till the end of the church year; thereupon the Second Series of Synodical Conference Gospels.

A ROYAL PRIEST—IN MY WORLD CITIZENSHIP

The Theme for July.—This month concludes the annual theme suggested by Synod's Co-ordinating Council, "The Priesthood of Believers." The Sunday following July 4, the 4th Sunday after Trinity, provides propers on the Christian's witness of behavior in this present world. The 5th Sunday after Trinity is similar, and the text chosen for the study below co-ordinates with the Epistle and Gospel for that Sunday. The other two Sundays of the month stress chiefly the Christian's personal growth.

Sermon Study on 1 Tim. 2:1-6 for the Fifth Sunday After Trinity

The theme for the month of July is "A Royal Priest—in My World Citizenship." This theme focuses our attention on the worldwide scope of the obligations and sympathies of Christians both in political and in spiritual matters. This theme is clearly reflected and developed in the lections for the fifth Sunday after Trinity. The Epistle urges us to be all of one mind, to have compassion one of another, to love as brethren, to be pitiful and to be courteous. The Gospel lesson is the story of the draught of fishes and the call of the disciples to become "fishers of men." The text which was selected for this study likewise exhorts us to be royal priests in our world citizenship.

To appreciate the full power of this text, we should review the background for the First Letter to Timothy. In all probability it was written after Paul had been released from his first Roman im-

prisonment. He had returned to Ephesus and had begun the work of reorganizing and strengthening the congregations there. Then he had been called to Macedonia and had left Timothy, his trusted assistant, to carry on the work in Ephesus until Paul himself could return. But the Macedonian visit dragged on. Paul knew that Timothy would need advice and guidance on several pressing points, and so he wrote him this letter. In Ephesus, Timothy had been especially disturbed by the heretical teachings of Hymenaeus and Alexander and by the necessity of establishing some form of order in the liturgy and in the general congregational life. Apparently the situation called for prompt and vigorous action.

We should also bear in mind that the times were out of joint. The Roman empire was beginning to seethe, and its massive foundation was cracking. Nero was on the throne, and by precept and example he was encouraging a life which sought forgetfulness in sordid pleasures. Paul's own beloved people, the Jews, were becoming increasingly restless. They were antagonizing the Roman rulers by actions which became more bold and flagrant with each passing day. The time of their destruction was at hand. It needed only the refusal to offer up sacrifices to the emperor to bring their Temple, their city, and their nation crashing down upon them. We can feel the tremors and the tensions of that age since we live in one which has much in common with it.

As an alert Christian citizen, Paul had his fingers on the pulse of Church and State. His purpose in this First Letter to Timothy was to set the Church in order and at the same time to make it mindful of the political situation and the obligations which it owed to that field. We should at all times, then, bear in mind the fact that this letter was prompted by a pressing, practical situation. It is not theory. It is practical advice given by the inspired Apostle to meet a real life situation.

The urgency of the need is strongly emphasized in the text. Paul begins by saying *παρακαλῶ*, "I exhort." A few of the early manuscripts, perhaps sensing this note of urgency, changed the indicative to the imperative. The evidence does not justify the introduction of this form into the Textus Receptus, but the imperative does help us to catch the real spirit of the letter.

The particle *οὖν* also carries this same note. It can be under-

stood in two ways. Commentators generally regard it as resumptive, and if it is used in that way, it would seem best to refer it back to 1:18-19. These verses, according to Phillips, repeat Timothy's ordination vow. The οὖν, then, reminds Timothy of the solemn vow which he made at one time. The memory of this vow was to furnish him with the courage and the determination he needed to carry out the difficult job which faced him at Ephesus.

Οὖν can also be taken as an intensifying particle. In the papyri it is frequently used in the sense of "by all means." Mantey finds this usage in the New Testament in about sixty-five places. In that sense it fits nicely into the spirit of this passage, and the first words then would read: "I command that by all means. . . ." To emphasize the importance of what he is about to command, Paul also told Timothy that it must be done *πρῶτον πάντων*. This phrase does not in itself say that the prayer which Paul was about to command must always be the first concern and the first duty of a Christian congregation. It rather means that there were special considerations in that situation which induced Paul to give it first place in his directions to Timothy.

And so in the phrase *παρακαλῶ οὖν πρῶτον πάντων* we find clearly outlined the spirit of pressing urgency which characterizes this passage. "I command that by all means, and as the first thing, there be made prayers. . . ." The Church's chief duty in a time of political disturbance is public, congregational prayer. Paul does not blush or hesitate when he calls his people to prayer. He does it rather in the spirit in which youngsters hail the landing of the Marines in the Saturday matinee. Prayer is *the thing* which can help. We note that Paul did not urge the Ephesian Christians to make their influence felt through various community organizations, such as the Kiwanis, the P. T. A., or ward political groups. These are all good, of course, and they all have their place, but Christians make their greatest contribution through the congregational prayer. From this section we gain a dramatic insight into the overwhelming strategic importance of general prayer in meeting a threatening situation. Jeremias calls this congregational prayer the high point of congregational life and the truest expression "*eines lebendigen Gemeindelebens*."

Paul, then, is calling the people to prayer services in much the

same manner that most Protestant denominations assemble their people at regular intervals today. But Paul does not say that this liturgy is to be the basic form. Other passages in the New Testament indicate that various liturgies were in use. We should keep in mind the point that this liturgy was developed to enable a specific congregation or group of congregations to meet a specific need. It was not borrowed *in toto* from another age, nor was it set up as a rigid pattern for later generations of churchgoers to follow.

Paul says that *δεήσεις*, *προσευχάς*, *ἐντεύξεις*, *εὐχαριστίας*, are to be made for all men. Much has been written about the four different words for prayer which Paul uses here. Augustine found a very clear-cut distinction among them, comparing them to the four different prayers used at four different points in the early Communion liturgy. Luther translated "*Bitte, Gebet, Fuerbitte und Danksagung*." Generally the following distinctions are maintained. *Δήσεις* approximates our word "petition" and here refers to prayer in general. It is also used of secular petitions. Kittel says that *δέσεις* can mean either a general expression of one's piety or a specific prayer which springs from a specific situation. He gives it the latter meaning in this passage. *Προσευχή* refers to general prayers, but, in contrast to *δέσεις*, it is used only of prayers for religious things. *Ἐντεύξεις* is a striking word. It is derived from *ἐν-τυγχάνω* and means, etymologically, a falling in with a person, a drawing close so as to enter into familiar communion with him. *Ἐντεύξεις*, hence, implies a free and familiar prayer in which the petitioner draws close to God. We think of Abraham's prayer for Lot and of Jacob's wrestling with the Angel as striking examples of *ἐντεύξεις*. *Εὐχαριστία*, according to Trench, expresses that which ought never to be absent from any of our devotions, namely, the grateful acknowledgment of past mercies, as distinguished from the earnest seeking of future. It is the highest form of prayer, he says, for only it will continue in heaven and in increased measure when we fully appreciate how much we have to be thankful for. Trench feels that these four words do not contemplate four kinds of prayer, but that rather they permit us to view prayer from four different sides and under four different aspects. He urges us not to stress the differences too strenuously.

Some of the force of *ποιεῖσθαι* is lost in the English, where we

have no choice but to read it as a pure passive, as, incidentally, most commentators do take it. Alford and Winer suggest that it be taken as a genuine middle. This prayer is to be a real manifestation of our genuine self-concern. We are to put our whole beings into the situation for which we are praying. Chrysostom understood it in the middle sense, as is clearly revealed in the following passage in which he commented on the Church's practice of general prayer: *πῶς ὑπὲρ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου καὶ βασιλέων, κ.τ.λ., ποιούμεθα τὴν δέησιν.*

With the phrase *ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων*, we pick up one of the chief motifs of this passage. The entire passage emphasizes the universality of the Christian's concern for mankind. We find that thought repeated in *ὑπὲρ . . . πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων, πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς γὰρ θεός, εἰς καὶ μεσίτης, ὑπὲρ πάντων.* We are taken up to the pinnacle of a high mountain so that we may survey all peoples of all times and feel a sincere love for them being kindled in our hearts. Provincialism, geographical or temporal, has no place in the Christian outlook. The scope of his concern for his fellow man must be as wide as Christ's own love. Though we rightly object to the loose use of the term "Fatherhood of God," we Christians do have an obligation to love all men and to "do good unto all men."

We are to pray for kings and for all that are in authority. This does not limit the universal command of verse one, but merely illustrates its application in a specific field, in this case, government. And, as we shall see, the prayer for kings is designed to benefit all men. This universality of interest is good (absolutely or relatively?) and acceptable in the sight of God, who will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. The will of God is all-inclusive; ours can be no less. What God wills, we will. God's will is that the human race should be one in every respect, just as He is One, and the Mediator, the Man Christ Jesus, is also One. According to the revealed will of God, there is to be no discrimination among men. All are of equal worth, all have the same origin, all should have the same ultimate destination, and therefore the Christian manifests equal concern for all men. Jesus gave Himself a ransom *for all*, and therefore our concern must be *with all*.

What is the object of this petition which we are to address in behalf of all men, of kings and of all that are in authority? Paul answers this question in the second half of verse two: "that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty." That is one aspect of the Christian's concern which Paul here considers.

The Christian is to pray for a concrete and external result, not for an attitude which should be present in his own heart, namely, a quiet and submissive spirit which keeps him from becoming contentious and a source of trouble to the State. Ellicott explains the *ἵνα* clause as follows: "That through their good government we may enjoy peace. . . . The blessing the powers that be will receive from our prayers will redound to us in outward peace and tranquillity." The blessing which this prayer seeks is the still, quiet life. The direct result expected from this prayer is an increase in the political skill and social acumen of the rulers so that those conditions may more generally prevail which are conducive to the leading of a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. "Ἡρεμος brings to mind the tranquillity which arises from without, and ἡσύχιος brings to mind the tranquillity which arises from within.

Εὐσέβεια καὶ σεμνότης describe fully the life pattern of the ideal citizen. Although both words stem from the same verb, σέβομαι, and although they are frequently used almost interchangeably in profane authors, dictionaries commonly do make an important distinction in their meaning in this passage. Εὐσέβεια is explained as the true reverence toward God, which comes from proper knowledge. Σεμνότης is explained as "a grace and dignity not lent him (the citizen) from the earth, but which he owes to that higher citizenship which is also his; being one who inspires not respect only, but reverence and worship." Tertullian summarized the word in this phrase: "*Ubi metus in Deum, ibi gravitas honesta.*" The crying need in America today is for public and private citizens who are εὐσεβεῖς and σεμνοί in all walks of life. (Cf. "This Is Our Greatest Danger," *Reader's Digest*, January, 1952.)

What is the relationship between the world peace which is the center of discussion in verses one and two and the world salvation which is discussed in vv. 4-6? Mosheim felt that prayer for all, and specially for kings, serves only to maintain the peace without

which the spread of Christianity would be hindered. Most commentators argue that the true point of the universal prayer which is here commanded and the noble concern for all men which this passage reveals is obscured and weakened if this thought is introduced. They say that Paul commands us to pray unselfishly for the betterment of the world in general. Regular repetition of that type of prayer is the major contribution which Christians can make toward world betterment. The $\delta\varsigma$ clause, as is frequently the case with relative clauses, may indeed have the sense of ground or reason.

But, in opposition to most commentators, we must say that there is no clear-cut distinction between the physical and the spiritual thoughts of this passage. Paul proceeds smoothly from a discussion of world peace to a discussion of world salvation. Nor should that absence of a clear distinction surprise us. The Lord has but one revealed will, and that is that He would have all men to be saved. Every aspect of His will as it manifests itself in the lives of human beings is directed toward the accomplishment of that goal. The universal concern of the Christian for all men should not be itemized and broken down into concern for their physical well-being and, as a separate item, concern for their spiritual well-being. The two go together. The prayer of vv. 1-2 is a prayer for political well-being, but it should not be divorced in spirit from the grand thoughts which are expressed in vv. 4-6. Because the Christian prays for the highest good for all men, he is also desirous that they should enjoy every other good. But the secondary goods which men enjoy are to contribute in some measure to their being blessed by the highest good. Paul says this same thing in Romans 13. There he tells us that the powers that be are ordained of God and that they are God's ministers to us for good. The end of their governing should be that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty and that we may "cast off the works of darkness and . . . put on the armor of light." Magistrates may do this without ever having a personal religious thought and without ever being aware of the fact that they are serving religious purposes. With eternal souls as the prize, all our prayers must be related in some way to their eternal happiness. Temporal happiness is a highly desirable by-product, but it is only a by-product. Our prayer for world peace,

then, is an integral part of our prayer for world salvation. We disagree with Mosheim, who makes world peace only the means to the end and with the majority of the rest of the commentators who make it an end in itself.

How are these two goals, world peace and world salvation, to be obtained? The world peace which Paul describes can be obtained only through the preaching of the Law and the Gospel and through prayer. These are the same means by which world salvation is to be obtained.

In his *Letters to Young Churches*, Phillips makes an easy transition from verse two to verse four. He translates verse three: "In the sight of God, our Savior, this [i. e., the *ἵνα* clause of verse two] is undoubtedly the right thing to pray for; for His purpose is that all men should be saved" and should come unto the knowledge of the truth. What is the relationship between *σωθῆναι* and *εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν*? Hofmann says they are identical. Heydenreich says that *ἐπίγνωσις* is the means by which God would accomplish the salvation of all. Meyer says that *ἐπίγνωσις* is the goal to which the rescue (*σωθῆναι*) leads. Robertson points out that the *ἐπίγνωσις ἀληθείας* or its equivalent is used ten times by Paul in the sense of the full intellectual apprehension of Christianity. He prays for this for his people so that they will not fall prey to the speculations of the Gnostics. It is true that the Church does advance only as it grows in edification. (Cf. Caemmerer, *The Church in the World*.) There is yet another intriguing alternative. Liddell and Scott, Passow, and Moulton and Milligan cite numerous examples from profane authors and from the papyri in which *σώζομαι* is used in the sense of saving or preserving someone from material and physical harm and danger. Preuschen-Bauer find that it is used in this sense also in the New Testament. This verse could then be understood as an effective drawing together of the themes of world peace and world salvation. The sense might be rendered in this way: God will have all men to be preserved from danger and to be maintained in at least a reasonable degree of security so that He might have the opportunity to bring them to the knowledge of the truth.

We have had occasion to comment on vv. 5-6 already in another connection. These verses give additional reason for the uni-

versality of the Christian's concern, but they also describe for us the oneness of the will of God by which He will have all men to be brought from darkness into the light. V. 6 is one of the clearest statements of the doctrine of the vicarious atonement to be found anywhere in the New Testament. Trench suggests that we lean more heavily on this passage than on the word ὑπὲρ alone, as is customary.

As is so frequently the case in the New Testament, καὶρὸς ἰδίος indicates a period of time which began with the fullness of time and which is still continuing today. Christ's death on the Cross is the testimony that the time has come for Him to come unto His own. We are bearing witness today in καιροῖς ἰδίοις.

The theme of the Christian's sincere concern for his fellow man might be developed in several ways. One might speak on "Our Three-fold Obligation." 1. Toward God, who will have all men to be saved. 2. Toward the neighbor, who is the object of God's loving will. 3. Toward myself — How do I discharge these obligations? The outline followed in this sermon study might also be used. "Congregational Prayer." 1. Its Nature. 2. Its Scope. 3. Its Basis. 4. Its Object. The relationship between world peace and world salvation might be treated in a very profitable manner on the basis of this text. 1. World Peace — Its Nature and the Means of Achieving It. 2. World Salvation — Its Nature and the Means of Achieving It.

Janesville, Wis.

HERBERT T. MAYER

Some Anti-Pelagian Echoes in Augustine's *City of God*

Among the solutions which Christians have offered to the problem of the origin of evil in God's good world, St. Augustine's *City of God* is still classic. The political development of the fifth century presented a situation which demanded some answer to this problem, and the Augustine who addressed his great apologetic treatise *De civitate Dei* to that development had been dealing with the problem of evil in a number of polemical treatises as well, namely, in those directed against the Pelagian heresy. The issues involved in the Pelagian controversy were clear and fundamental in Augustine's thinking.¹ So much is this the case that these issues form a significant, if not dominant, motif in many of Augustine's works not usually classified as "anti-Pelagian." The present brief study seeks to make a few observations on this aspect of the *De civitate Dei*, which appears to this observer to have been neglected by many students of the treatise.² It suggests that a neglected theme of the treatise is stated in the words: "... the stranger in this world, the citizen of the City of God, predestined by grace, elected by grace, by grace a stranger below, and by grace a citizen above" (XV, 1: p. 285).

From the year 413 to 426 Augustine worked on his *City of God*. To the height of his great argument he asserted eternal Providence and sought to justify the ways of God to men. Like Plato's *Politeia*, Augustine's *De civitate Dei* has often been interpreted as a political treatise, dealing with issues like the relation between Church and State.³ But in all these attempts, as in similar interpretations of Plato, the interpreters seem to have overlooked what Gustaf Aulén calls the *Lebenstrieb* or *Grundmotiv*.⁴ "Because God foresaw all things, and was therefore not ignorant that man also would fall, we ought to consider this holy city in connection with what God foresaw and ordained [secundum id, quod praescivit atque disposuit, civitatem sanctam debemus adserere], and not according to our own ideas, which do not embrace God's ordination" (XIV, 11: p. 271).

Let us consider this holy city in this way. In his preface to this "great and arduous work" the author indicates his awareness of "what ability is required to persuade the proud how great is the virtue of humility, which raises us, not by a quiet human arrogance, but by a divine grace, above all earthly dignities that totter on this shifting

scene" (p. 1). Thus he shows that in opposition to the tottering and shifting of human efforts he wishes to extol the sovereignty of divine grace.

This aspect of the *City of God* comes to the fore repeatedly throughout the treatise, but especially in the already quoted fourteenth book.⁵ It undergirds a good part of Augustine's discussion about the Roman Empire and its history. So, for instance, the "bloody bliss of Marius" was due "to the secret providence of God, that the mouths of our adversaries might be shut. . . . And even if the demons have any power in these matters, they have only that power which the secret decree of the Almighty allots to them [quantum secreto omnipotentis arbitrio permittuntur]." (II, 23: p. 38.) And power was not granted to men like Nero "save by the providence of the most high God, when He judges that the state of human affairs is worthy of such lords. . . . Though I have, according to my ability, shown for what reason God, who alone is true and just, helped forward the Romans . . . there may be, nevertheless, a more hidden cause, known better to God than to us, depending on the diversity of the merits of the human race." (V. 19: pp. 101—102.) It is this God who "gives kingly power on earth both to the pious and the impious, as it may please Him, whose good pleasure is always just. . . . He, therefore, who is the one true God, who never leaves the human race without just judgment and help, gave a kingdom to the Romans when He would, and as great as He would. . . . Manifestly these things are ruled and governed by the one God according as He pleases; and if His motives are hid, are they therefore unjust?" (V, 21: p. 103.)

The purpose of presenting these rather extensive quotations has been to show that Augustine looks at Roman history and its evils, as at everything else, *sub specie aeternitatis*—yes, *sub specie aeternae Dei gratiae*. For even the demons, maintains Augustine, probably with reminiscences of his former Manichaeism, "cannot do anything of this kind unless they are permitted by the deep and secret providence of God, and then only so far as they are permitted" (VIII, 24: p. 163). This is, of course, rooted in Augustine's conception of God⁶ and His immutable, sovereign will. "He is called Almighty only because He is mighty to do all He wills [certe non ob aliud vocatur omnipotens nisi quoniam quidquid vult potest]" (XXI, 7; p. 458). Such a comprehensive view of immutability as Augustine's must exclude all anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms; in a long passage which has become a Christian classic on this problem, Augustine explains *Umstimmungen in Gott* in terms of unchangeableness (XII, 17: pp. 237

to 238). To be consistent in his doctrine of God, he was ultimately driven to ask rhetorically: "Why, then, should God not have created those whom He foresaw would sin, since He was able to show in and by them both what their guilt merited and what His grace bestowed, and since, under His creating and disposing hand, even the perverse disorder of the wicked could not pervert the right order of things?" (XIV, 26: p. 282.)

Here is one of the issues of the Pelagian controversy — the problem of evil and the problem of Adam, which occupies so large a portion of Book XIV. It is probably inevitable that it should come up somewhere along the line; for the *civitas terrena* began with Cain and the *civitas Dei* with Abel (XV, 1: p. 284). Evil begins with Adam. Nor does it help matters any to carry the problem beyond Adam to Satan, as the demonological section of the *City of God* and the theodicy of Milton amply demonstrate. Adam is the crux; from him all men descend and both cities proceed, to join the good angels or the evil, as God secretly but justly decrees (XII, 27: p. 244). Augustine does not want to be a determinist, but he is more zealous of preserving the foreknowledge of God than of avoiding determinism. "They are far more tolerable who assert the fatal influences of the stars than they who deny the foreknowledge of future events," he says in a long discussion (V, 9-10: pp. 90-93), which sets up the eternal paradox of divine foreknowledge and human freedom. The inhabitants of the *civitas terrena* are predestined to suffer eternal punishment with the devil, just as the inhabitants of the *civitas Dei* are predestined to live eternally with God (XV, 1: p. 284).⁷ And yet God "governs all things in such a manner as to allow them to perform and exercise their own proper movements" (VII, 30: p. 140). In fact, "no one is evil by nature, but whoever is evil is evil by vice" (XIV, 6: p. 266).⁸

Basically, this is Augustine's answer to the problem of the origin of evil, both in the Pelagian controversy and in the *City of God*: that sin came into the world not because, though within, God's foreknowledge, nor yet because of man's free will, but because man abused that free will; and that this abuse of free will brought death into the world and all our woe.⁹ This aspect of free will becomes somewhat clearer if viewed in terms of the eschatology in the *City of God*. Augustine summarizes the entire situation in a few words: "Neither are we to suppose that because sin shall have no power to delight them, free will must be withdrawn. It will, on the contrary, be all the more truly free, because set free from delight in sinning to take unfailing delight in not sinning. For the first freedom of will which man received when

he was created upright consisted in an ability not to sin, but also in an ability to sin; whereas this last freedom of will shall be superior, inasmuch as it shall not be able to sin." (XXII, 30: p. 510.)

Additional light on all of this is offered by a consideration of some isagogical facts about the *De civitate Dei*. For one thing, it was composed during the years of the Pelagian controversy; so great an upheaval as this in Augustine's thought cannot have been without influence on his masterpiece. Then, too, the *City of God* was written at the urging of "my dearest son Marcellinus" (Preface: p. 1), who, it will be remembered, was partly responsible for involving Augustine in the Pelagian controversy.¹⁰ Nor dare Pelagius himself be forgotten. Jacobi has attempted to show that Pelagius' world view was in many ways almost deistic, that, in opposition to Augustine, he taught very little divine participation in human affairs.¹¹ Although Jacobi, influenced by the centuries of historical polemic, probably finds too much in the meager documentary evidence he produces, Pelagius' doctrine of God's grace in action, as summarized by Loofs,¹² was, to say the least, not the same as Augustine's from this angle either. The problem is that Augustine expressly states he is not dealing with "those who either deny that there is any divine power or contend that it does not interfere with human affairs" (X, 18: p. 192).¹³

From these data it would appear that there may be more of an anti-Pelagian tone to the *City of God* than is generally thought.

NOTES

1. Even Adolf von Harnack, who can hardly be said to be partial to doctrinal controversies, says: "Es hat vielleicht keine zweite, gleich bedeutsame Krisis in der Kirchengeschichte gegeben, in welcher die Gegner so klar und rein die Prinzipien, um die es sich handelte, zum Ausdruck gebracht haben." *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (Tuebingen, 1920, III, 167).
2. Throughout this paper I quote the *City of God* by the traditional book and chapter divisions; the page number after the colon refers to the translation by Marcus Dods in Philip Schaff (ed.), *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, II (Buffalo, 1887), pp. 1—511. In a few critical spots I have added the Latin. My discussion owes much to Heinrich Scholz, *Glaube und Unglaube in der Weltgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1911), esp. his "Voraussetzungen und Grundbegriffe," pp. 20—69.
3. For two extreme presentations see Bruno Seidel, *Die Lehre vom Staat beim heiligen Augustinus* (Breslau, 1910), which presents a Roman Catholic viewpoint; and H. Reuter, "Die Kirche als 'Reich Gottes,'" *Augustinische Studien* (Gotha, 1881), which criticizes such interpretations.
4. *Das Christliche Gottesbild in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* (German translation of *Den kristna gudsbilden*, 1927; Gütersloh, 1930), p. 54.
5. Perhaps this is why Scholz regards Book XIV as "heimatlos." He groups it with Book XIX, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

6. For the following compare the stimulating chapter "Augustins Gottesbegriff und die Entstehung der Gnadenlehre" in Viktor Stegemann, *Augustins Gottesstaat*, No. 15 of the "Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur Philosophie und ihrer Geschichte" (Tuebingen, 1928), pp. 4—18.
7. The phrase "altera aeternum supplicium subire cum diabolo" offers a severe exegetical problem. But the force of the parallelism in "altera," as well as the lack of anything else in the context to which the "subire" can be attached, makes the interpretation given above most plausible. Cf. also the question, spoken of the evil angels: "Who, then, can doubt that God, either in foreknowledge or in act, separated between these and the rest?" (XI, 33: p. 224.)
8. On the significance of "vitium" cf. XI, 17: p. 214, with Dods' note there, as well as his note *sub* XII, 1: p. 227.
9. Interesting to note is Coquaeus' comment, recorded by Dods (to XII, 21: p. 241), that "this passage is leveled against the Pelagians."
10. On Marcellinus cf. the note in Benjamin B. Warfield, *Two Studies in the History of Doctrine* (New York, 1897), p. 28, and Scholz, *op. cit.*, pp. 7—8, where reference is made to Angus.
11. J. L. Jacobi, *Die Lehre des Pelagius* (Leipzig, 1842), p. 27.
12. In his article on "Pelagius und die pelagianischen Streitigkeiten," *Real-encyklopaedie fuer protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, XV, 747—774.
13. He repeats this statement at least twice explicitly (XII, 24: p. 242; XXI, 7: p. 458), and implicitly *passim*.

St. Louis, Mo.

J. J. PELIKAN

Swedish Episcopal Letter on Sex Problems

The Lutheran Quarterly, February 1952, published "A Letter Concerning a Life Problem of a People—To the Clergy of the Church of Sweden from their Bishops." The episcopal letter indicates implicitly how tenuous the line between the world and the Church has become in a country which is so predominantly Lutheran. But are we not confronted by the same problems? This episcopal letter will serve to point up and correctly evaluate some of the problems which confront the Christians in our modern society. Dr. Bergendoff has translated the letter from the Swedish text and has also kindly given permission for this reprint. The letter follows.

F. E. M.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

Marriage, a legalized union of one man and one woman, has as its purpose the common welfare and care of parents and children. It seeks the development and deepening of their character and is the absolute foundation of community life. The Church wishes to protect and preserve this gift of God.

Marriage vows in God's will are irrevocable. Security and stability in the fellowship of the home depend on the fact that the marriage bond is indissoluble. The unshakable intention of the parents to belong to each other throughout life saves them from being driven whither in

their deepest nature they do not wish to go. Together they should share prosperity and adversity, and should seek so to solve the difficulties and conflicts which they encounter that such do not separate them but instead bring them closer to each other. Honest effort to overcome disharmony when it arises can unlock new possibilities of happiness and bring richer results than a frictionless marriage. Security and stability in the fellowship of the home—as all experience confirms—are of incomparable importance also for the healthful development of children. Children who must grow up in a home disharmonious or broken go out into life with radically diminished opportunities.

For this reason the Church is opposed to that divorce-mentality of our day which would make marriage a contract binding the parties only as long as they desire each other. Exceptions do arise when divorce can and really should take place. In such cases, as the words of Jesus remind us, the basic reason is always in the hardness of the human heart. When man and wife are both concerned about humble obedience to the will of God the thought of divorce cannot be permitted. But when one parent is guilty of conduct which destroys the marriage, and persists in such conduct, divorce can be warranted for the sake of the parent or of the children. Even this should not take place until all other ways of settling the disagreement have been tried.

RELATIONSHIPS OUTSIDE OF MARRIAGE

Only marriage can provide the security which is a prerequisite for a life together of lasting happiness. In an age where looseness in sexual relationships becomes increasingly common only the irresponsible can fail to see the peril threatening both the young and the entire community. Many parents seem to have lost faith in the possibility of maintaining fixed and firm norms for their children. But just as little as widespread dishonesty can induce the Church to lower the standard of truth, ought the sexual looseness of our day influence the Church in its stand that all sexual relationship before and outside of marriage is sin both against God and man. Unless a proved and steadfast will to faithfulness and life-long companionship is present, the fundamental requisite for trustful sexual intercourse is lacking. The Church cannot approve even of so-called common-law marriages, since the thought of possible dissolution is not excluded from the start. From social or other viewpoints they may seem to be different in character, but this does not mean that they can be justified from a Christian viewpoint.

When the Church decisively warns against sexual intercourse before marriage it does so in a truly positive spirit. For one does not do youth

a service by a compromise which will only increase the difficulties standing in the way of a happy marriage.

The Church opposes all talk about trial marriages. There is no guarantee in trial marriage that it will bring success. When there is genuine affinity and true love, there is a possibility for mutual concern to discover increasing harmony in the sexual relationship.

A difficult problem arises when two young people wish to marry but have no prospect of a home. Such a situation reveals a fundamental defect in modern society which the State has an urgent duty to remedy through its social politics. Where the problem is not solved the Church recommends to the youth that they get married even if for a time they must live apart from each other. Such a solution is certainly not ideal, but the couple do live their sexual life under these circumstances as man and wife who through marriage have wanted to certify that their relationship is permanent.

CONTRACEPTIVES

The Church cannot approve of the idea that pre-marital intercourse is permissible if contraceptives are employed. Contraceptives can indeed reduce the risk of an illegitimate child, but this changes the character of pre-marital relationships just as little as the fact that one party to adultery may be sterile changes the nature of the adultery.

There is something wrong in any marriage where the couple are biologically normal but want no children. Yet children are not the sole purpose of marriage. Above all, marriage is significant because it establishes a firm and genuine fellowship between man and woman. Sexual intercourse between man and wife can be a complete expression of this fellowship though unusual conditions may make necessary an avoidance of conception. Seriously considered this situation does lead us to concede that under certain circumstances contraceptives may be permitted.

ABORTION

From experience we know that fateful conflicts can arise between the dutiful love to the living and to the unborn. Situations can occur where a choice must be made between the life of the mother or of the unborn child. Our Church does not share the opinion that abortion under any circumstance is to be condemned. But on the other hand our Church is deeply distressed over that abortion-mentality which would give to the pregnant woman free choice as to whether or not her child should be born. Only in those cases when conception is the result of a clear violation of a woman may she herself request abortion and when

after thorough consideration she decides that it would be better if this child were never born.

When a physician finds on examination that a continuance of conception until birth may in all likelihood mean the death of the mother or physical or mental incompetence for either mother or child, he may consider the possibility of ending pregnancy. On such medical advice Christian love can counsel abortion. But to put an end to pregnancy on account of the community's inability to provide life's social opportunities for the child and the mother is to indict a community which ought to be concerned about the remedy of such social faults. The Church appreciates the establishment of clinics which through expert and responsible personnel seek to prevent abortions. The Church is especially conscious of this need under the present law on abortions, for she has experienced in her ministry of counselling what anguish and anxiety can plague both the subject of abortion and the physicians and nurses who must take part in the operation.

The Church strongly emphasizes the responsibility of the father both towards the expected child and the expectant mother. Any man who evades this responsibility is unworthy both as an individual and as a member of society.

From a Christian point of view the child out of wedlock is just as valuable as the one born in marriage and is entitled to the love and care of those to whom it belongs.

Pastors and members of the Church must consider it their duty to prevent abortion on the part of a mother in desperate circumstances by being ready to offer economic support or finding a suitable foster home.

STERILIZATION

The Church raises no objection to the theory that some persons because of constitutional reasons should not reproduce themselves. But sterilization involves a mutilation and should not be resorted to except after full consideration of all factors. Experience can testify that serious mistakes have been made in this matter. It is therefore necessary to emphasize the importance of careful investigation before such an operation is undertaken. Study ought to be made of the possibility both of loving care for the offspring and of eventual favorable development even in regard to constitutionally-determined factors so that the subject might be restored to complete social life.

It is important that if sterilization be undertaken the subject shall have full knowledge of what this means. There may be cases where such knowledge may instead be given to those closest of kin.

ARTIFICIAL INSEMINATION

The science of genetics has discovered the possibility of conception by artificial means. Its motive in this research has been highly commendable, namely, a solution to the problem of childless marriages. From a purely genetical viewpoint it may seem to be of secondary importance where the sperm comes from. But this question is highly important from the viewpoint of religion and morality.

The Church does not believe any ethical problem arises when the sperm is transferred from man to wife — in homologous insemination. This may be regarded as a medical means of realizing the aim of marriage.

But the Church takes a different attitude towards heterologous, or alien, insemination — where the sperm is transplanted to an unmarried woman, or to a married woman from some one else than the husband. The Lord says concerning man and wife in marriage that the two shall be one. This unity is manifested in their child. A child resulting from insemination has a natural father from whom both physical and psychological traits are inherited. Such an expression as "test-tube children" therefore implies either a conscious or unconscious misuse of terms.

A man who provides sperm for insemination has violated the very principle of fatherhood. He becomes the parent of children whom he does not know and to whom he neither can nor is allowed to give fatherly care.

A woman who gives birth to a child of alien insemination can hardly avoid, during the period of pregnancy and of rearing the child, thinking constantly about the man who is the natural father of the child. Even if only in the form of a shadow he assumes a presence in the child. Thus the parents violate the commandment of God that the two shall be one.

The child born of alien insemination is the victim of a wrong. The very fact that the natural father must remain anonymous — unless indeed the marriage is to be an obvious three party affair — deprives the child of a right to know who are its parents, a right supported both by Christian principle and legal tradition. If the child discovers that he was conceived by insemination he will be threatened by mental conflicts, especially in two of life's most serious periods, that of puberty, when he will question his parentage, and that of marriage, when he may be in doubt as to forbidden relationships. If it is concealed who are children of insemination and who by natural conception, an element of uncertainty will be introduced into community life which may make

all children suspicious, but especially those who grow up in a one-child family.

The Church (in Sweden) is responsible for the community records and is therefore particularly concerned about the insertion of false or misleading data in the church records which would result from alien insemination. In such a case these records would no longer be a dependable source of research in inheritance or kinship.

HOMOSEXUALITY

Homosexual practices are a violation of the commandment of God. The provisions of the new Swedish penal law cannot therefore be regarded as giving ethical approval to homosexual acts. It can however be granted that other means than imprisonment are necessary if a homosexually inclined person is to be helped. The one who truly struggles against this affliction should be met with all the sympathy and encouragement which are called for by Christian love.

The medical profession should be particularly concerned in finding medical means to free the homosexually inclined from their abnormal impulses. It is of importance that a homosexual of weak character should not be entrusted with youth whom he might be tempted to corrupt.

The community cannot escape the duty of taking strong measures against those who promote homosexual practices in the interest of monetary gain.

A heavy responsibility rests on the clergy to bring to the individual in his particular condition the kind of help indicated by the principles described above.

To complain about the evil of our times is of little avail. Of more importance is the giving of help through preaching, teaching, and counselling. All the while we should keep in mind the Savior's own attitude. Only in the Sermon on the Mount and in Matthew, chapter 19 (and in parallel passages) is the sexual problem expressly mentioned. In none of the Gospels is there any detailed instruction on this subject. We find in Jesus nothing of that intensive busying with sex as an isolated theme which is so common in modern discussion. His instruction concerning adultery fits naturally into the context of life as a whole. If we follow this suggestion the Church will help people to understand that the sexual problem will never be solved in isolation. In its teaching of youth the Church must make clear that the life of love is a gift of God which is not to be relegated to some dark realm of dishonor. On the other hand an overemphasis on the sexual can easily imperil a healthy development.

We ought not to forget how sharply Jesus warns against adultery and how highly he estimates marriage. The joy of the wedding and of giving birth to a child became to Him a natural symbol of the joy of the kingdom of heaven. The commandment regarding adultery is reaffirmed by Jesus in strong terms.

The Church should remember also wholeheartedly the mercy of the Savior towards those who have broken this commandment. He did not speak contemptuously about the prostitute. He received the sinful woman in the Pharisee's house, forgave her many sins without any reservation, and paid more attention to her than to the self-righteous Pharisee. At times it has seemed as if the Church could not bring herself to forgive this sin as fully as other sins. Herein the Church does not follow in the Master's footsteps. The path of the Church must be that of Jesus—firmness in moral principles, clear teaching in regard to transgressions of the commandments of God, and limitless mercy towards those who repent of their sins.

"And be not fashioned according to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God" (Romans 12:2).

AMONG OUR CONTRIBUTORS

THEODORE HOYER, D.D., is professor of Church History at Concordia Seminary.

W. F. BECK is editor of *Bible Stories in Pictures*, published by Concordia Publishing House, and is a frequent contributor to our journal.

JAMES R. BLACKWOOD, TH.M., until recently pastor of the St. Charles Presbyterian Church, is now pastor of the campus church at Wooster, Ohio. Rev. Blackwood, a graduate of Princeton Theological Seminary, is the son of the well-known Homiletics professor of Princeton.

HERBERT T. MAYER, M.A., is pastor of Mount Calvary Lutheran Church at Janesville, Wis.

The remaining contributors are members of the Concordia Seminary faculty.

THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER

DOCTRINAL TEACHING STRESSED

More and more it is recognized that the vague, colorless teaching which Modernistic churches dispense is a diet that entails starvation. A writer in the *Manchester Guardian Weekly* (England) of March 6, 1952, reports on a meeting in which the question of doctrinal instruction at "missions," that is, evangelistic services, was ventilated. He contrasts present methods of winning people for the Church with those in vogue fifty years ago. At that time, he says, when evangelists presented their plea, a strong appeal was made to the emotions. This method, he holds, should not be put on the shelf in an absolute sense. But at the same time there is the intellect of people, he emphasizes, which has to be utilized. Instruction has to be given. The writer admits that the Free Churches (those Protestant churches not connected with the State Church, the Church of England) have not used this method to any great extent. The Roman Catholic Church, on the other hand, has employed it with telling effect. The writer used to be a reporter, and he states that when his assignments took him to Roman Catholic "missions," he found the messages were delivered "with power and clarity." He furthermore breaks a lance for the proper training of Sunday school teachers. Too often, so he points out, people are employed as teachers in Sunday schools who are not qualified. If doctrine is important, it has to be taught; and if it is to be taught successfully, the teachers have to be competent. It is a pleasure to chronicle that these facts which most of us consider altogether obvious are placed before the public in an influential British paper.

WILLIAM ARNDT

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF LUTHER FOR CHRISTIANS OF OTHER COMMUNIONS

When on November 15, 1950, Bishop Anders Nygren celebrated his sixtieth birthday, Archbishop Yngve Brilioth of Uppsala presented to him a dedicatory volume with a *tabula gratulatoria*, listing admirers from all over the world, among them our own Dr. Theodore Graebner and Dr. Lawrence Meyer, and most important essays, which discuss problems facing Lutheranism today, by such prominent churchmen as (just to mention a few) Walter Kuenneth, Hanns Lilje, K. H. Rengstorff, Edmund Schlink, Helmuth Thielicke, Otto Dibelius, Gustaf Aulén, Ragna Bring, and others. Dr. Graebner's *Bad Boll* essay *Kirche und die Kirchen* has also been given a place in this appealing book, which because of its comprehensive presentation of subjects of

vast importance to Lutheranism today deserves careful study in all Lutheran areas. The English edition bears the title *World Lutheranism of Today* and is obtainable at Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. (438 pages, 9×6. \$4.85). The essays are presented in German, English, and French.

We do not refer to the book to review it, for that is quite another task, but merely to point out the excellent essay by Prof. Philip S. Watson, of Birmingham, England, *The Significance of Luther for Christians of Other Communions*, and its challenge to Lutheranism in America to supply the world with at least a practical, though complete edition of Luther's works for those who cannot read German. Professor Watson shows that Luther's influence on English denominations has been tremendous, and this despite the fact that Luther's works were not too widely and well disseminated in England. The article must be read to be fully appreciated, but a few facts, culled from it, may perhaps demonstrate what Luther might do in English-speaking countries today were he only given a chance to witness. According to Professor Watson, Luther lived and testified to the truth through John Bunyan, who said of the great Reformer's exposition of *Galatians*: "I do prefer this book of Martin Luther upon the *Galatians*, excepting the Holy Bible, before all the books that ever I have seen, as most fit for a wounded conscience" (p. 374). From Luther's *Galatians* Charles Wesley learned the doctrine of justification by faith alone. His brother John learned the doctrine from Luther's Preface to *Romans*, and though he later bitterly attacked Luther, charging him with "total ignorance with regard to sanctification," he nevertheless regarded him as unsurpassed in his treatment of justification. Luther's influence in England, however, was still greater through the "Lutheran material" which "found its way into the confessional documents, such as the "Ten Articles," the "Bishops' Book," the "Thirteen Articles," and others. In Scotland, Luther's theology influenced men like Patrick Hamilton, George Wishart, and even John Knox. Luther's enemies in England of course continued, but there also arose defenders of his theology which has permeated the thought of all evangelical denominations. We recommend for diligent study this fine essay as also the others which *Welt-Luthertum heute* offers to its readers. J. T. MUELLER

THE BIBLE, TRADITIONS, AND THE CHURCH

"No. . . . The Bible Is NOT Our Sole Guide!" This is the caption of an advertisement which recently appeared in some of the leading semipopular periodicals such as *The Atlantic Monthly* (May). The

advertisement was released by the Supreme Council Knights of Columbus, Religious Information Bureau. It seeks to demonstrate that "Christianity began with the coming of Christ—not with the writing of the Bible"; that "Christ had established His Church . . . long before any of the books of the New Testament had been written"; that "the Savior did not command us to read anything, but He did command us to hear His Church"; that "the Bible was not intended to be . . . the sole source of Christian teaching and belief"; that "the Church had existed 1,600 years, in fact, before the theory was advanced that the Bible should be the *sole* guide to Christian believers"; that "Christ established His Church to carry on His mission and spread His teaching"; that "while the Bible is the inspired Word of God, there are certain truths taught and exemplified by Christ which it does not record"; that "these truths will be found in the life, practice and teaching of Christ's Church—traditions dating back to the days of the Apostles and ante-dating the printing of the Bible."

There is nothing new in this interpretation of Christian history. The Roman Church has always espoused it and, in substance at least, gave it official sanction at the Council of Trent (1545—1563). Yet it irritates one to note that so reputable a journal as *The Atlantic Monthly*, for the sake of a few hundred paltry dollars, opens its advertisement columns to the perpetuation of one of the most egregious misinterpretations of which the Roman Church has become guilty. And it disturbs one to think that many readers of the advertisement who, because they seek guarantees for religious truth in the visible manifestation of the Church, will be further impressed with the pretensions of the Roman Church. For the obvious purpose of the advertisement is to promote the dogma of the Roman Church that it alone may lay claim to direct descent from Christ and His Apostles. What are the basic issues and facts involved?

1. The statement in the advertisement that "the Bible is the inspired Word of God" is, indeed, true. The fact is that in recent works on Biblical doctrine, Roman Catholic authors have unequivocally confessed the truth of divine inspiration of the entire Scriptures. But these same writers virtually cancel out and contradict their demonstrations of the divine inspiration of the Bible by their support of doctrines and dogmas which conflict with the clear teachings of the inspired Word of God and continue to teach the same errors which the Lutheran reformers repudiated in the confessional writings of the Lutheran Church.

2. The Roman Church has, especially since the days of the Ref-

ormation, fastened on three sources of divine truth. These are: a) the Bible; b) the traditions; c) the voice of the Church, that is, the official pontifical pronouncements on doctrine and life. Especially within the past century it has become evident that the traditions of the Church as well as the pronouncements emanating from Rome are regarded in the Roman Church as authoritative and final as the voice of God which spoke through the Prophets, through God's Son, and through the Apostles. One need think only of the promulgation of the dogma of the Bodily Assumption of Mary by Pope Pius XII on November 1, 1950, and its all but immediate and universal acceptance by Roman Catholics.

3. We recognize the existence of traditions in the Christian Church. But we must distinguish between "traditions" and "traditions." There are traditions in the Church which, provided they do not conflict with the teachings of Scripture, may be useful and may even be deserving of perpetuation by the entire Christian Church. We think of the tradition known as the *signaculum crucis*, which Luther retained and which we still employ in some of our religious ceremonies. The three ecumenical creeds are, in a sense, traditions. They were formulated by the Church of the early centuries and have been transmitted through the centuries to our own day. There is nothing objectionable in these creeds, and the Lutheran Church recognizes them as correct statements of Biblical truths.

But the advertisement in *The Atlantic Monthly* speaks of another kind of traditions. It admits that these traditions are not recorded in the Bible, but it maintains that "they were taught and exemplified by Christ" and are found "in the life, practice and teaching of Christ's Church—traditions dating back to the days of the Apostles and antedating the printing of the Bible." The advertisement does not provide instances of this kind of traditions. The best one can say about them is that they have lived a precarious existence in the minds of Roman Catholic scholars and that, to this day, the honest historian has been compelled to search them out in the twilight zone of apocryphal Gospels, legends of saints, and in dubious statements in early patristic writings. Luther and the reformers and, following them, practically the entire Protestant Church rejected these traditions as sources of Apostolic teaching and divine truth and as binding on Christian consciences. Nevertheless, that these traditions are of value to the Roman Church need hardly be demonstrated. The dogma of the Bodily Assumption of Mary could hardly have been promulgated except for "proofs" of this dogma which Roman Catholic scholars claimed to

have discovered in the early traditions of the Church (see Heinrich Bornkamm, "Motive und Konsequenzen des neuen Mariendogmas" in *Für Arbeit und Besinnung*, Nr. 12, 1951).

4. Indeed, the first list of New Testament writings which corresponds completely with the one approved by the Christian Church of our day appeared as late as A.D. 367. But this does not mean that the New Testament books were not known, read, and recognized as divinely given books before 367. These books were written by Christ's Apostles or their immediate assistants, such as Mark and Luke, and represent the oral teachings of the Apostles. The content of these books, together with those of the Old Testament, constitute the one source of Christian teaching. Though, due to the imperfection of the Church, certain books not written by Apostles or their assistants enjoyed, for a time, a prestige similar to that enjoyed by the Apostolic writings, the former were eliminated from the New Testament collection by the close of the fourth century. It is not without significance that the great ecumenical creeds of the Early Church rest squarely on the teachings of the Apostolic, rather than on those of apocryphal, writings. For the Christians of the early centuries the Apostles' doctrine as recorded in their writings was the final criterion, source, and authority of divine truth.

5. It is true, the Christian Church existed before the New Testament writings came into being. Peter and Paul, James and John, and the rest of them were Christians and members of the Christian Church before they wrote their books. Christian churches existed in Jerusalem, Samaria, Antioch, Galatia, Ephesus, Rome, and elsewhere before any, or many, New Testament books were written. And all these churches and many more existed before the New Testament books were assembled in a definitive collection. But neither was there at the time when the New Testament books were written a Roman Catholic pope, nor was there a Roman Catholic Church. The Church existed, but this was the Church of Jesus Christ, which recognized only Him as its Lord and King and which regarded itself as His body. And the several churches of that early day were guided in matters of faith and life by the doctrine of the Apostles which these Apostles had received directly from the Head of the Church.

When these Apostles passed from the scene, their doctrine, which they had articulated also in writing, that is, in the acknowledged books of the New Testament, was transmitted to later generations. It was transmitted through the preaching of the Apostles' doctrine as well as through the writings bequeathed to the Church by the Apostles.

The Early Church was built, therefore, not on the utterances of an authoritative voice in Rome, not on decrees of councils and synods dependent on sources other than Apostolic teaching, but on the doctrine of the Apostles as the early Christians knew it from the Apostolic writings. Small wonder that Luther's defiant declaration at the Diet of Worms rocked the world. And small wonder that the "*sola Scriptura*" principle so forcefully expressed in the confessional writings of the Lutheran Church is regarded by the Roman Church as an intolerable heresy. For if it is admitted that the Holy Scriptures are the only source of divine truth, then the alleged "traditions dating back to the days of the apostles" as well as pontifical utterances which pretend to be divine oracles are the words of men and not the words of God.

Conclusions: In their Confessions most Protestants regard the Bible as the inspired Word of God and they regard it as the *only* inspired Word of God. Though they have a warm appreciation of many traditions which in course of time originated in the Church and contributed to the life and worship of the Church, they assert with the Reformers of the sixteenth century that all traditions, whether they can be dated back to the days of the Apostles or whether they are of later origin, are subject and subordinate to the Holy Scriptures and may never become sources of divine truth alongside the Holy Scriptures. Lutherans today, as in the sixteenth century, reject the antichristian presumption of the Roman Catholic pope to speak as the voice of God in matters governing doctrine and life. They reject, finally, the pretension of the Roman Church that it is the Church which Christ founded and that it has preserved intact what Christ taught and what He intended His Church to teach. But that Church is not the Roman Church headed by the pope, but the one holy Christian and Apostolic Church, the communion of saints. Cf. 1 Tim. 3:15. P. M. B.

ROME REDISCOVERS THE BIBLE

In *Christian Life* (March, 1952) James V. Claypool of the American Bible Society publishes an article in which he draws attention to the spread of Bibles carried on by Romanism today. In the closing paragraph he writes: "The current scholarly edition of the New Testament by the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine is outstanding mostly because it is being put into not less than 2,500,000 Catholic homes in America, fully as many as the total issues of our Revised Standard Version New Testament." Before that, in three paragraphs, he sums up the impressions which he received from recent "authoritative pronouncements of the Roman Catholic Church." Two of these are of

special interest to Protestant readers, namely (2): "The Roman Catholic attitude toward the Bible is not quite as narrow as Protestants ordinarily think"; and (3): "It is important that this venerable ecclesiastical organization which we are wont to say 'never passes up a good idea' and 'always knows a good thing when it sees it,' is going all out for Bible reading at a time when Protestants are doing less Bible reading than their fathers and grandfathers."

Without being pugnaciously negative over against the good which is being accomplished by the modern Catholic Bible movement, for evidently also this new Bible emphasis is directed by God toward the fulfilment of Christ's prophecy "that this Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the world" (Matt. 24:14), it is well for us to keep in mind that Rome has not experienced a change of heart in the matter of general Bible reading by the Catholic laity. For one thing, Protestant versions are still being opposed by the Roman clergy in Catholic countries. Again, the versions which Rome promotes are distinctively oriented to its specific doctrines either by translation itself or by the footnotes, or both. Never should Protestants forget the canon, laid down by Leo XIII in his encyclical *Officiorum et Munerum*, of January 25, 1897, according to which "all versions in the vernacular, even by Catholics, are altogether prohibited, unless approved by the Holy See, or published under the vigilant care of the bishops, with annotations from the Fathers of the Church and learned Catholic writers." No doubt, too, there never would have been a Douay Version had not the English Protestant Version become dangerously popular in Roman Catholic areas. It is in light of these and other historic data that the modern "authoritative pronouncements of the Roman Catholic Church" must be considered. By way of conclusion we quote one of these from Dr. Claypool's editorial to show how even today Rome writes and interprets church history: "The Catholic Church, and only the Catholic Church, ever really taught the Bible to the people at large, and for this purpose she employed painting, poetry, music, sacred plays, and the ceremonial of her services. By these means the people, very few of whom could read, were made familiar with the Bible story and teaching. The Reformation swept away all these things and thus deprived the people of their only means of becoming acquainted with the Word of God, for it was and is useless as a means of instruction to scatter Bibles amongst people who cannot read. Hence the Reformers, instead of giving the Bible to the people, took it away from them." We ask: "Did the sacred plays and the ceremonial of Catholic services, together with what else is here mentioned,

really tell the whole, pure story of Jesus and His love?" Again: "Should not Catholic writers, before accusing the Reformers of taking the Bible away from the people, recognize the established facts that through the Reformation the peoples of the earth received not only readable Bible versions, but also the necessary education enabling them to read the Scriptures themselves, so that they do not have to rely for religious instruction on 'sacred plays' and 'ceremonials' which falsify the saving Gospel of Christ?"

J. T. MUELLER

THE GOSPEL IN THE SACRAMENTS

When Professor Anders Nygren of the University of Lund a short time ago was created Bishop of Lund, he, in agreement with the custom of the Church of Sweden, sent to the pastors of his diocese a pastoral letter on their ministerial office and message, which has now appeared in an English translation under the title *The Gospel of God* (cf. review, *Concordia Theological Monthly*, February, 1952, p. 152f.). In this generally sound and inspiring book the fifth chapter, "The Gospel in the Sacraments," endeavors to point out the relation of the Gospel to the Sacraments and vice versa. Here we find, among many correct and important statements, some which are not in agreement with Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions. Very rightly Dr. Nygren emphasizes the Gospel character of the Sacraments and condemns the Romanistic view, which also in the Sacraments "alters it [the Gospel] into a law and 'righteousness of works.'" Distinguishing between the Romanist and the Lutheran doctrine, he writes: "The sacrifice goes from us to God, the testament from God to us. In the Lord's Supper it is God who in Christ stoops down to us. In the sacrifice of the mass we seek to climb up to God in all His majesty and make ourselves acceptable to Him" (p. 66). So far, so good! But Dr. Nygren goes beyond Luther and the Lutheran Confessions when he writes: "Luther says of the water in Baptism, 'Without God's word it is only water and no Baptism.' In the same manner one can say of the word which is set in contrast to the Sacraments, 'Without the Sacraments it [the Gospel] is only a word, and not the power of God, not God's act for our salvation.' The Gospel is given to us by God in the inseparable unity of word and Sacrament. What God has joined together, let not man separate" (p. 69). Just before that he remarks: "Only in the unity of both [the Gospel and the Sacraments] is the full import of the Gospel as a message, which is at the same time a deed, and as a deed, which is at the same time a message, to be found. He who would retain the Word, but push the Sacraments aside, waters down the Word and robs it of

its character as a deed" (p. 68). On page 69 he tells us: "That which takes place in the Sacraments is that the Lord Christ by them incorporates us into Himself, and makes us living members in the body of Christ, in the Church."

This last statement is correct, but what is wrong in the author's previous representation is, on the one hand, that he ascribes something specific to the Sacraments which cannot be ascribed with the same force to the Gospel, and, on the other, that according to his words, the Gospel without the Sacraments would lose something of its character, in short, that the Sacraments serve as supplements to the Word, adding to its completion. Over against this, Luther taught that whatever God does for the sinner's salvation, both in justification and in sanctification, He does solely through the Gospel, applied in preaching, in Baptism, in the Holy Supper, in absolution, and in the mutual conversation and consolation of brethren (Smalc. Art., Part III, Art. IV; *Triglote Concordia*, p. 491). With respect to the special character and purpose of the Sacraments, Luther and the Lutheran Confessions describe them as the "visible Word" and, more specifically, as pledges of His gracious promises conveyed in and by the Gospel, or, to use the words of the Augsburg Confessions, as "signs and testimonies of the will of God toward us, instituted to awaken and confirm faith in those who use them" (Art. XIII; *Triglote Concordia*, p. 49). *Haec enim sunt signa novi testamenti, hoc est, signa remissionis peccatorum* (Apology, Art. XII (V.), 42; *Triglote Concordia*, p. 260). All who go beyond the clear words of Scripture concerning the Sacraments are in danger of misrepresenting their essence and purpose and of depriving the Gospel of its central place and function in the *ordo salutis*.

J. T. MUELLER

THE APOTHEOSIS OF ALBERT SCHWEITZER

The Catholic World (March, 1952) warns against forgetfulness of the fact that while Schweitzer's heroic, self-sacrificing work as a medical missionary in Africa indeed deserves admiration, he denies in his philosophy the first and major premise of the Christian faith, the doctrine of Christ's deity. We quote a few striking paragraphs.

"What is called 'Schweitzer's living example of Christianity at work' is appealed to as perfect justification of his philosophy. Those who make such an appeal ignore the fact that what he lives on is his spiritual residue of inherited Christian ethics. His philosophy as such really by-passes the certainties of our Christian heritage and offers instead only the paralyzing uncertainties of agnostics.

"What wonder, in the face of so many American leaders' acceptance

of his actual teaching as that which witnesses a 'humble belief in Christ's fundamental humanity,' that our cultural epoch appears to foreigners as one that has discarded Christianity and is looking about for some different kind of moral assurance to take its place! That moral assurance is certainly not to be found in Schweitzer's *Quest*, which represents neither 'primitive' Christianity nor any possible approximation of it.

"The muddle-mindedness of our age as to what Christianity is, our vagueness and indefiniteness about Christ, represents intellectual dishonesty as well as wrong religion.

"While it remains everlastingly true that in the realm of ethics the best part of belief is action, yet the Christian's living faith-basis is so much more important than any action . . . that there is no comparison between the two indissoluble aspects of Christianity. . . . His notion that Jesus was a mere man of an era, deluded by false Messianic hopes, breaks Christianity's first premise, standing as it does in His own Person. An infinite number of Schweitzer-like lives of medical and other like services to human welfare cannot make any kind of restitution for that broken premise. . . . The African missionary-doctor's humanism (and our own idolatry of humanism has been given a not inconsiderable impetus from Schweitzer's) is as much at odds with his philosophy as Hegel's own church-going, sacrament-receiving private life as a Lutheran was with that pantheist's public announcements in his *System*. No less than Hegel's *pretended* Christianity, Schweitzer's involves the same essential denial as it represents the appearance (and what a glorious appearance!) of Christianity with its reality."

J. T. MUELLER

BRIEF ITEMS FROM "RELIGIOUS NEWS SERVICE"

A bill liberalizing the policy for selecting YMCA trustees has been passed by both houses of the New York Legislature. The measure repeals a section of the law which says that each YMCA trustee "shall be a member of some Protestant evangelical denomination, not more than two of whom shall be members of any one denomination." The bill was backed by the State YMCA organization.

* * *

More than 53,000 displaced persons were brought to America prior to March 1 under the Church World Service Resettlement Program. In addition, over 30,000 have been resettled in the United States through the National Lutheran Council.

* * *

A veteran atheist leader, Robert H. Scott of San Francisco, Calif., has filed a formal complaint to the Federal Communications Commission against the American Broadcasting Company for refusing time for a reply to a network broadcast of a radio plan which, he charged, heaped ridicule and contempt upon atheists. He condemned what he called "a veritable orgy of prayer and piety" which for several years has been increasing on the radio without any opportunity being afforded atheists for a reply. "The keeping of American radio open for the broadcast of religious programs and closed to atheism and kindred views is a misuse of the public domain," he claimed.

* * *

The Presbyterian Historical Society in Philadelphia is celebrating its centennial with a campaign to enroll 1,000 new members. The Society's collection includes more than 100,000 historical manuscripts, rare prints, paintings, 75,000 bound records of Presbyterian churches dating back to 1706, and relics of the colonial period.

* * *

A full-sized replica of Moses' Tabernacle in the wilderness, with all its symbolic objects, is exhibited in St. Petersburg, Fla. The tabernacle, 75×100 feet, is housed in a stone shrine on the shore of Lake Maggiore. It was built by the Rev. Hart G. Baldwin. Sunday afternoons and daily during the tourist season he dresses in a replica of the ornate costume of an Old Testament high priest and explains the symbolic meaning of each part of the sanctuary . . . no admission charge. Each

part of the shrine is constructed according to the specifications given to Moses during his days on Mount Sinai and followed by him in the construction of the tabernacle. Full-sized reproductions include the outer court, the gate, the brazen altar, the Holy Place, five golden pillars, seven golden candlesticks, the golden altar, the table of shewbread, and the Holy of Holies.

* * *

The *Christian Advocate*, the official weekly publication of the Methodist Church, is celebrating its 125th anniversary. Regular editions of the publication run to 325,000 copies. The anniversary issue will be printed in 500,000 copies. . . . It is one of the oldest religious publications in the nation. In its early days it became the most widely circulated newspaper in the young nation. Methodist circuit riders, who carried bundles of the paper in their saddlebags, acted as circulation and distribution agents. Secular newspapers of the day limited themselves to strictly local circulation. The *Advocate*, as a national newspaper which often was the sole news source reaching outlying communities far from the Eastern seaboard, carried many regular domestic and foreign news items unrelated to religion; among the latter, a regular feature was a listing of current prices for commodities—including rum.

* * *

Denmark is drafting a new constitution. The *Catholic Weekly* of Denmark, *Katolsk Ugeblad*, is urging the abolition of a constitutional provision that the king must be a member of the Danish State Lutheran Church. . . . The present king, Frederick IX, has no male heirs. The argument used by the paper is that no such stricture is imposed upon the heads of the various government ministries; hence the king is "worse off than any of his subjects." He should be given a free hand.

* * *

"We concluded that the reason the United States has never lost a war and never won a peace is that it has a wonderful department of war, but no department of peace," said Dr. Glenn Clark; so he and Dr. Frank Laubach are leading an unofficial "department of peace" in a five-story building in Washington, D.C. It is the center of a number of prayer groups which include members of Congress and their families. Chairman of the "prayer council ring" which is behind the movement is Mrs. Peter Marshall, wife of the former chaplain of the Senate and the author of *A Man Named Peter*.

With the death of Giovanni Battista Cardinal Nasalli-Roccadi Cornelianio, Archbishop of Bologna, the Pope's College of Cardinals is reduced to 43, or 22 below full quota. There are now 17 Italian and 31 non-Italian cardinals. * * *

The Vatican newspaper *Osservatore Romano* admitted that it may have been deceived as to the authenticity of photos published last November purporting to show the miracle of a "revolving sun" near the Shrine of Our Lady of Fatima, Portugal, in 1917. . . . The "Miracle of the Sun" is said to have taken place at Fatima on October 13, 1917, when over 70,000 persons flocked to the site where three shepherd children claimed to have seen an apparition of the Virgin Mary. Witnesses stated that the crowd was awe-struck by the sudden melting of a heavy overcast sky into brilliant sunshine; the sun appeared as a revolving wheel of light throwing out varicolored hues in all directions. . . . The *Osservatore's* front-page statement came shortly after the *Voice of Fatima*, official journal of the shrine, had alleged that the photos were not authentic; that the pictures were not taken at the shrine in 1917, but at Torres Vovas, a few miles away, in 1923, and that they portrayed only an atmospheric effect at sunset. The Vatican paper said that the Fatima photos had been submitted to it as genuine: "If in spite of all this the photographs, as it is stated, were not authentic—a thing which at the time was not thought possible—it is clear that our good faith was taken advantage of. It is clear, however, that the prodigy of 1917 (at Fatima) is beyond discussion, as it happened before tens of thousands of witnesses, not a few of whom are still alive."—Yes, they saw an "atmospheric effect at sunset"! While the admission of the *Osservatore* is far from sufficient, perhaps some of the readers will draw the right conclusion and apply it to other so-called miracles. * * *

Dr. Channing H. Tobias, a Negro Protestant leader in the YMCA movement and member of the United States delegation to the United Nations, whose name has lately appeared in the press because of his visit to Pope Pius XII, protested against the imprisonment in Czechoslovakia of the Associated Press correspondent William Otis at a recent U. N. General Assembly session in Paris. The Ukrainian delegate countered by charging shameful treatment of Negroes in Georgia and anti-Negro laws in other States. In his rebuttal to this charge, Dr. Tobias replied: "I am a Negro, born in Georgia, and I have survived my youth with sufficient good frame to stand here as a representative

of all the people of the United States. True, we have some bad laws and some good ones not enforced, but the thing we have which you have not is freedom to fight bad laws and insist on good ones being enforced."

* * *

Senator Estes Kefauver, at a churchmen's Washington seminar attended by nearly 150 church leaders (including some of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod), gave the advice that church members ought to write members of Congress more often. Too much of the Congressional mailbag is full of appeals from various selfish interest groups. "It is difficult for members of Congress to keep a perspective," he said. "If the good people back home would write us more often giving us their views on matters of national legislation and public policy, it would be very helpful. We need to hear more often from those whose only interest in legislation is the public welfare and who approach public issues from the moral point of view. It is to you church people that we must look for support for a good Congress and a good government. If you don't help give guidance to your public officials, you are abdicating that responsibility to those with selfish axes to grind." . . . The three-day seminar was devoted largely to workshop discussion groups on such topics as immigrant labor, United Nations appropriations, anti-filibuster resolutions, international disarmament. Also housing, the problems of the American Indian, child labor, the Voice of America, and immigration legislation were discussed.

* * *

Delivering a Lenten sermon on "The Church and the State" to an overflow crowd of worshipers at the Church of the Sacred Heart in Washington, D.C., Auxiliary Bishop Fulton J. Sheen of New York said that American Catholics subscribe wholeheartedly to separation of Church and State as practiced in the United States; Church and State ought not to be too intimately associated; history has shown that "when we become too close to the things of this world, too interested in the political order, or too absorbed in the economic, we have suffered for it." He said that Catholics can be loyal to the First Amendment of the Constitution, with its provision for religious liberty, without any mental reservation. "There is a lie abroad that the Roman Catholic Church is perverting the nation, is bent upon raiding the treasury, is guilty in some way or other of subverting the Constitution in order that the State may be subservient to the Church. This is not true. We are not in favor of an established Church *in*

21

the United States (italics by the undersigned). We do not want an established Church and have never wanted it. We are loyal to the United States, and we propose to remain loyal to it."—As for the vast bulk of American Catholics, we believe that that is true. Now, if the Bishop could only show us a document in which the Curia in Rome declared that Pope Boniface VIII was wrong in the Bull "Unam Sanctam" and Pius IX was in error in some of the statements of his Syllabus of Errors of 1864, and show us the signature of Pope Pius XII under the document—that would take us much farther toward the belief that the Roman Church is no longer *semper eadem*, but has changed.

* * *

An eruption of volcanic origin was reported to have occurred on Mount Ebal, midway between Jerusalem and Nazareth. It is the first known volcanic activity on the Biblical mount, although the area has been the center of earth tremors. . . . Mount Ebal rises some 3,092 feet above the ancient city of Nablus, known as Shechem in Biblical times, which lies in the fertile valley between Mount Ebal and Mount Gerizim. On Mount Ebal's summit are the ruins of a thick-walled fortress, called El-Kala, dating back to the Crusaders or earlier, and on its western slope is a Moslem shrine containing what is claimed to be the skull of John the Baptist. Abraham and, later, Jacob and his sons camped at Shechem (Nablus), and in 933 B.C. Jeroboam chose it as his capital when the northern tribes separated from the kingdom of David.

* * *

The first German financial contribution for refugee aid outside Germany has been sent to the World Council of Churches in Geneva, Switzerland, by the Central Bureau of *Hilfswerk*, relief agency of the Evangelical Church in Germany (EKID). The contribution comprised donations from all German regional Evangelical Churches. A letter accompanying the contribution stressed that it was "an expression of gratitude for the aid which Germany and German Evangelical Christians received during the past years from foreign churches. "It will give proof," the letter said, "of the growing consciousness of responsibility among German Protestants for the distress of refugees beyond the German borders."

* * *

The case of the Lima school near Durand, Wis. (see last month's Brief Items), and 13 other public schools, all of which are taught by nuns, has been decided by the State School Superintendent of Wis-

consin, George E. Watson, by denying State tax support to these schools. He held that in his opinion these schools violated State law in one or more of these ways: 1. They selected teachers on the basis of religious tests; 2. They included sectarian instruction in their curriculum; 3. They failed to operate a complete school of eight grades. The case will perhaps be taken to the courts for a decision.

* * *

The pastor of the South Hartford, N. Y., Congregational Church, the Rev. Marion C. Frenyear, paid only 25 per cent of her 1951 Federal income tax because she is opposed to the Government's "warlike ventures." She is a Christian pacifist, she declared, and "cannot support war in any way." . . . For the same reason she paid only 25 per cent of her Federal tax bill last year. The collector of internal revenue at Albany placed a lien against her salary and indicated that the same method would be used this year to collect the unpaid taxes. . . . Last year the delinquent taxes were paid by the treasury of the church, and the amount was deducted from the pastor's salary.

* * *

According to a report issued by the American Bible Society, some part of the Bible has been published in 1,049 languages and dialects, as of December 31, 1951. Fifteen new languages were added to the list last year. . . . The whole Bible has been published in 195 languages, a complete Testament in 252, and at least a Gospel or other whole book in 602.

* * *

The plan of uniting the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. (Southern), and the United Presbyterian Church (a plan recently approved by special representative groups of the three bodies at a meeting in Cincinnati) is opposed by a group of ministers and elders of the Southern branch who maintain that under the union plan "the Southern Church would find itself submerged, and its testimony stilled. Under existing conditions there will be no union until underlying problems having to do with church polity, doctrine, and administration have been faced and met. Should these fundamental issues be ignored, a split in Presbyterian forces is certain to result, with disharmony rather than unity resulting."

* * *

For the General Conference of the Methodist Church, meeting in San Francisco, April 23, the Church's Commission to Study the Ministry submits a report the highlights of which are:

1. The present rule prohibiting unordained supply pastors from administering the Communion shall remain unchanged.

2. The "no smoking" pledge shall no longer be required of a ministerial candidate, but he shall be asked "to make a complete dedication of himself to the highest ideals of the Christian ministry."

3. Standards for Conference membership shall not be lowered for supply pastors, but "supplies" shall be given every possible encouragement to complete the prescribed course of study to make them eligible for Conference membership.

To point 1 the commission, headed by Bishop Gerald Kennedy of Portland, Oreg., said: "It is hard . . . to see how ordination can retain any real meaning if unordained men, without putting forth any effort or following any discipline, have all the rights and privileges of ordination." (Of the 22,210 pastoral charges in the Methodist Church, 7,549 are filled by "supplies.") . . . To point 2: At present candidates for the ministry are required to answer satisfactorily the question: "Will you abstain from the use of tobacco and other indulgences which may injure your influence?" The report says: "This seems to single out one indulgence and leaves unmentioned any number of weightier matters. It raises to central importance an indulgence which does not merit such a place of honor." It is recommended that the committee "shall insist that the applicant recognize the great importance of living an exemplary life free from all harmful practices which would discount his ministry, such as the use of intoxicants, narcotics, and tobacco, and urge that he consecrate himself to purity of life in body, mind, and spirit.

* * *

Anent the announcement to members of Italian Catholic Action that membership in the YMCA and YWCA was forbidden under Roman Catholic Canon Law, YMCA headquarters in New York said that their most recent survey, in 1947, disclosed that 28 per cent of the membership of the movement in the United States was Roman Catholic.

* * *

In Ottawa, B.C., a city-wide boycott of stores selling obscene books and magazines was planned at a meeting of men and women representing every lay Roman Catholic organization in the Ottawa archdiocese. Under the plan drawn up "vigilante committees" will patrol the stores and note the establishments where publications listed as "objectionable" are sold, and the public will be urged to boycott these places. At the same time stores which "pass" the committees' exam-

ination will be given the fullest publicity, and the public will be encouraged to give them their patronage. . . . The Knights of Columbus and the Catholic Parent-Teacher Associations will lead the drive. . . . E. D. Fulton, M.P. for Kamloops, B.C., and author of the Fulton Bill, which outlawed crime comics in 1950, addressed the meeting and promised to seek the creation of a joint Commons-Senate committee to study new legislation on the subject. He claimed that a "New York combine" forced distributors and dealers to market indecent material under threat of having their entire book and magazine supply seriously depleted. He urged, however, that an aroused public opinion was necessary for the passage of required legislation; "the dealers will tell you they'd love to see some action, but that they are helpless."

* * *

A meeting of the Old Prussian Union Church, scheduled for May 11 to 15 in Goerlitz, Silesia, was banned by the East German government. No reason was given for the ban. . . . This is the old "*Unierte Kirche*," formed in 1817 by the administrative merger of the various "*Landeskirchen*." In 1947 they had a membership of 14,000,000, of whom, it is said, about 90 per cent were Lutheran and the rest Reformed. Dr. Luther Kreyssig of Magdeburg is provisional president of the group.

* * *

Every issue of *RNS* reports persecution of Roman Catholics behind the iron or the bamboo curtains and persecution of Protestants in Roman Catholic countries. . . . 3,700 Roman Catholic missionaries have been expelled from China, it is claimed. Bishop John O'Shea of Kanchow was accused at a public meeting of killing "many thousands of children" at his orphanage. . . . Cardinal Spellman, who visited Hong Kong, is quoted saying that the persecution of Roman Catholic missionaries in Communist China was "a repetition of the worst persecution and martyrdom in the early days of the Church." . . . The grief of the Pope over the persecution of the Church is described by Archbishop Gerald P. O'Hara, papal nuncio in Ireland: "Truly, Pius XII has been called upon to be a man of sorrows like his divine Master." . . . Meanwhile, a Presbyterian church at Ibague, Colombia, was stoned on March 20 by a crowd of children "gathered and led by three priests who urged them on: 'You must smash this serpent in the head.'". . . Baptists of Miglionico, in the province of Masera, Italy, complain that their church has been closed by the civil authorities. . . . In Toronto the Foreign Missions Division of the National

Council of Churches asked the U. S. State Department to take vigorous action to halt "a wave of attacks" on Protestant missionaries in Colombia. Dr. W. Stanley Rycroft declared: "there have been easily over 100 of these cases in the last two years"—Dr. J. A. Dell, in a recent number of the *Lutheran Standard*, adds: "It makes a difference whose missionaries are being persecuted."

* * *

An intensive inquiry conducted by parish priests in Rome revealed that out of a population of 1,800,000 only 400,000 attend Sunday mass regularly; another 400,000 fail to attend because they are "too young, too old, or too busy"—meaning that one million Catholics of Rome deliberately ignore their religious duties, as a Commission member said. In one parish, he added, out of 8,000 children only 500 attended Catechism classes. Which points to the oft-mentioned fact that church statistics in countries where everyone is counted as a member of the State Church unless by deliberate action he has secured his dismissal must be taken with a grain of salt.

* * *

A cable from Hong Kong announced that the last missionary of the United Lutheran Church in America remaining in Communist China has been imprisoned. This is the 27-year-old missionary Paul J. Mackensen, Jr., of Baltimore, Md. Charges against him are not known.

* * *

At the annual conference of the National Association of College and University Chaplains, the president of Howard University in Washington, D. C., Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, declared that the modern college and university is aware of being "deeply injured in its religious life." The injury resulted from the monopoly of the curriculum by highly specialized subjects, the preponderant and disorganizing influence of the natural sciences, and the disappearance of religion from its hitherto dominant place in the curriculum. "The university began its existence," he said, "with a Christian world view based on an assured conviction of the nature of human beings and the possibilities of world communities arising therefrom; but in the last 200 years it has been forced to operate within the boundaries of aggressive nationalism." . . . The meeting was attended by more than 100 delegates from 40 States.

THEO. HOYER

BOOK REVIEW

EVANGELISM, CHRIST'S IMPERATIVE COMMISSION. By Roland Q. Leavell. Broadman Press, Nashville, Tenn., c. 1951. XIII + 234 pages, 5¾ × 8¼. \$3.00.

The author is professor of evangelism at the Baptist Theological Seminary of New Orleans. He has prepared this book as a textbook for his courses. It includes much information presented thetically and provides bibliographies. Five chapters give a brief survey of evangelism in the history of the Church. Over half of the book outlines programs of evangelism by the Church and methods of personal evangelism. Each chapter provides suggestions for special study. A brief index is included.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

20 CONFIRMATION SERMONS. By Pastors of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn. 1951. 226 pages, 5½ × 8. \$3.00.

Again Augsburg produces an interesting collection of sermons, this time for the confirmation services of catechumen classes. They vary remarkably in method, and hence the volume will be stimulating for the pastor to read through in sequence, by way of refreshing his own preparation of confirmation sermons. This preparation is apt to be slighted, because it falls into one of the busiest seasons of the preacher's year. Some of these sermons stress the content and the program of training which the class has received, others the Sacrament of which they are about to commune, others the witness of the Christian life in which they are to engage, and still others the significance of the Church and membership in it. To this reviewer a confirmation sermon ought to stress the Church as the body of Christ and our membership in it through Baptism and by faith in the redeeming work of our Lord. Reading a volume like this reminds of the fact that there is no substitute in catechetical training or preaching for the warm and personal relation of the pastor to the hearers and the catechumens.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

THE LUTHERAN ORDER OF SERVICES. By Paul H. D. Lang. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 58 pages, 5 × 7½. 50 cents.

A simple discussion of our Lutheran orders of service prepared largely for the laity of the Church. It includes explanations of Lutheran orders of service in general, of the Order of Morning Service With and Without Communion, Matins, Vespers, Paraments, and Posture. The booklet can serve as an excellent basis for discussion of our liturgical practices and heritage for various groups of a parish which is intent upon using the worship materials of our Church intelligently and with understanding. Pastor Lang's presentation remains clear and sober throughout.

WALTER E. BUSZIN

VOICE OF THE HEART (CARDIPHONIA). By John Newton. Moody Press, Chicago. 1950. 432 pages, $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$. \$3.50.

John Newton's *Cardiphonia* merits indeed to be part of *The Wycliffe Series of Christian Classics*, a series which is to include about forty reprints released by the Moody Press. The series is to consist of "books which have shaped the spiritual thinking of generations of Christians, but which for many years have been found only in the libraries of successful collectors." The present volume includes also a biographical sketch of the author, written by William Culbertson. The author, John Newton, whose hymn "Glorious Things of Thee are Spoken" is sung by practically all English-speaking Christians, was likewise the author of the famous collection *The Olney Hymns*, published in 1770. From these hymns as well as from his *Voice of the Heart* one would never conclude that the author had once been "an infidel and libertine, a servant of slaves in Africa." He was brought to the knowledge of his need for a Savior from sin during four long weeks in which he and the other members of the crew faced death aboard a disabled sailing vessel that tossed and drifted in the grip of a violent storm. In 1780 Newton became the rector of St. Mary Woolnoth, in London. It was during this rectorship that he became famous. He died on December 21, 1807. — While Newton's *Cardiphonia* discusses the need for sanctification in the life of man, he does not go to extremes and become pietistic or purely moralistic. He refers often to the fact that a sanctified life is to be lived out of love for Christ, crucified and risen again. Since the volume is really a compilation of letters he wrote to people of various walks of life, it is not surprising to note that the author repeats himself quite often. Several letters are naturally more interesting, inspiring, and devotional than others. We refer particularly to Letters XII, XV, XVI, XXI, and XXIII, all of which are outstanding indeed. Letter XVI, which treats Psalm 23, deserves to be published in pamphlet form, as do also other letters which will bring relief and clarification to the distressed and confused soul.

WALTER E. BUSZIN

BIBLE LIGHT ON DAILY LIFE. By Philip E. Howard, Jr. Van Kampen Press, Wheaton, Ill. 1951. 211 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 8$. \$2.25.

A thoroughly evangelical devotional book which is a compilation of editorial notes the author has written for his columns in the *Sunday School Times*. While Mr. Howard's style is quite prosaic and at times even somewhat commonplace, his volume will give satisfaction to those who seek not inspiration, but rather simple words of homely assurance.

WALTER E. BUSZIN

EUROPE AND AMERICA, THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE WORLD CHURCH. By Daniel Jenkins. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, c. 1951. 72 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{3}{8}$. \$1.50.

The young author of this book is a Congregational minister in England who gained his ecumenical interests from J. H. Oldham and bases this

brief study upon impressions received while a Commonwealth Fund Fellow in the United States for one year. He also was a visiting Professor of Ecumenical Theology at the University of Chicago in 1950. He is modest about his appraisal of American Protestantism. Yet his remark seems appropriate:

... The churches have the resources to maintain the vast institutional structure that they are building. What America needs is a deeper knowledge of what it means to be the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth, built upon the foundation of the prophets and apostles with Jesus Christ as the chief cornerstone. America needs a theology that will give it the maturity, judgment, and power of self-criticism to handle power and wealth responsibly and a structure of church organization that will express and not obscure the essential nature of the common life of the people of God. (P. 39.)

Mr. Jenkins believes that although it is very necessary for the miracle to happen to wealthy America, it will nevertheless "enter into the kingdom of God" despite its riches. American isolationists will do well here to get a just impression of the seriousness and theological concern for the church of the European Ecumenical Movement, and American liberals will here find a sobering call to a more genuine theology.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

ATHEISM'S FAITH AND FRUITS. By James D. Bales. W. A. Wilde Company, Boston. 1951. 176 pages. \$2.25.

The author successfully demonstrates that modern atheism is not primarily concerned about establishing evidences for its basic premises, but rather about attacking and seeking to destroy belief in theism. Atheism, too, as he shows, has its creed, albeit a creed whose validity it is far more difficult to demonstrate than a creed which confesses faith in God. The book is a fine addition to current Christian apologetical literature.

PAUL M. BRETSCHER

BOOKS RECEIVED

From Men's Club, Belmont Methodist Church, Nashville, Tenn.:

OUR GOD IS ABLE and Other Sermons. By John L. Ferguson. 5½ × 8, 174 pages. \$2.50.

From Moody Press, Chicago 10, Ill.:

THE BIBLE AND MODERN SCIENCE. By Henry M. Morris. 5¼ × 7¾, 191 pages. \$2.50.

FAMOUS MESSAGES OF WILLIAM R. NEWELL. 5¼ × 7¾, 251 pages. \$3.00.

From Fleming H. Revell Company, Westwood, N. J.:

FOUNDATIONS OF THE FAITH. Twelve Studies in the Basic Christian Revelation. Edited by David J. Fant. 5½ × 8, 189 pages. \$2.50.

EW

low
of
lest
ms

to
of
get
rch
ere

m-

ri-
out
m,
ore
he

8,

4,

es.

an